A U M

Good Karma is that which is pleasing to the Spirit in man; bad Karma is that which displeaseth the Spirit.—*Vishishtadwaita Philosophy.*

Judge not that ye be not judged. With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.—*Jesus.*

And from the book of Life the dead were judged by their works.—*St. John.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. VI FEBRUARY, 1918 No. 4

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

HOW ARE THEOSOPHISTS TO LOOK AT THE WAR?

EXTRACTS FROM SOME RECENT CORRESPONDENCE.

A CORRESPONDENT writes: "I want you to help me get right on the big war idea. How are Theosophists to look at it? Are we supposed to throw up our hats for Wilson? Is all he does just right? Are we to take the stand 'Our Country right or wrong'? We believe Belgium got her deserts, don't we? I am inclined to be a 'Pacifist', but is that the right stand? I have made some caustic comments about these Christians at war, at the lack of success achieved in praying for the war to stop; but as the whole world is battling the Kaiser, and as the sum total of hate is enormous, does the power of thought—the fact that 'thoughts are things' show up favorably as a factor, either way? Sometimes I wonder whether my individual ideas are right, and I want to know how I should look at the war and present disturbances, if I want to be a consistent Theosophist."

As some of the ideas included in the answer to the above Correspondent may be helpful to other students, THEOSOPHY is printing below excerpts of the letter sent in reply:

"You ask how Theosophists are to look at the war: well, they have to look at it as it is. They did not make it; and they have to set theories aside and face *the condition* wisely.

"Are we supposed to throw up our hats for Mr. Wilson? Is all he does just right? We do not have to throw up our metaphorical or other hats for anything or anybody, but we should be able to applaud right speech and action by *anybody,* anywhere; we

should be impersonal in such things if we are to apply the doctrines we study and teach.

"Is all he does just right? Like any other human being, he doubtless makes mistakes, but since war has been declared by America, his general course has been in the right direction, and he has shown a wideness of vision and strength of character, as well as a general intention to accomplish the best for all peoples.

"We must remember that *he* did not declare war; he was forced to so speak by the sentiment of the nation. The rights of peoples throughout the world to self-government were threatened and over-run by the German *entente,* and a common danger to civilization had arisen.

"Our government, however imperfectly expressed, is founded on Brotherhood, equal rights for all, freedom of thought and opportunity in every direction that concerns the general good. This basis cannot properly be construed as merely applying to this nation only, or to any individual in it; it must be applied to all peoples if we are not to be classed as selfish deniers of our own principles.

"As a nation, we are bound to uphold and assist all peoples, who as integral parts of a common humanity, are struggling against oppression. From a theosophic point of view, as well as the general consensus of opinion, we are now doing all we can to destroy the possibility of usurpation of the common rights of humanity.

"The sentiment 'Our country, right or wrong' is just as foolish and wicked as for one to say, 'Myself, right or wrong'. It is this very sentiment that has made Germany and the German people hold out so long, and has blinded her people to a perception of the rights of other peoples. With each one of us, 'I am my country' and if each one will strive to see the right and do it, 'my country will be right'. It is first, last and all the time, right, true and just individual views; views that include all, are just to all.

"If we say 'Belgium got her just deserts', let us continue to apply that attitude and say, so did Germany, France, England and America, as well as the individuals in America who do not like the results; let us be consistent whatever we think. That attitude however does not get us anywhere and must be wrongly based. Consider what the Gita says, 'the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked and the establishment of righteousness', a statement which is as much the spiritual and moral basis for individual action as it is for those Great Ones who 'incarnate from age to age'. 'As above, so below'.

"Pacifists are the most illogical, inconsistent and selfish people in this or any country at the present time. All peoples desire peace, for it provides a normal condition which permits progress; but when an individual, a nation, or a number of nations, conspire and act to disturb that normal condition, the others cannot maintain peace by saying that they object to war. There is a saying that

'One has to fight the devil with fire, which he understands, and not with holy water, which he does not understand.'

"The war that we are now engaged in is a war for brotherhood and is a recognition of brotherhood. America might for a time have selfishly kept out of the war and permitted oppression to work its will upon many; but, if it had been possible, the time would certainly come when the karma of its unfeeling conduct would have fallen upon it directly, for in refraining it would have denied and ignored the brotherhood of Man. Even as it is, this country added to the length and horrors of war by not awakening to a true perception sooner.

"It is the justice of America's action that appeals to Theosophists; the self-sacrificing spirit of its people that gives hope for this great nation, and through it for the world-at-large. The whole course of theosophic study and application is to arouse mankind to a sense of individual responsibility for evil everywhere. Karma is not only the effects of past thought and action, but the present opportunity to set in motion right and just ideas and actions that make for the good of all that lives.

"As to hate, it is never right; if anyone hates the Kaiser or the Germans, he is only adding force to 'hate'; but if the hate is impersonally against evil as the result of wrong ideas and action, then he can, and should apply himself to that course which will bring the conviction upon the mistaken actors that such ideas and actions are wrong, and cannot prevail. In all this, he 'hates' no one; he has not even hate in the ordinary sense in his heart; he prevents the further doing of evil; thus not only protecting the innocent and helpless, but preventing the guilty from incurring worse karmic retribution. He works for the Peace of all peoples, regardless of personal sacrifices, for he sees and knows that 'Nothing is gained in this world, or in any other, without sacrifice'.

"As to motives—there is no doubt that many motives have actuated our people, all together bringing about a common result. As individuals, we should recognize that it is ignoble to make war because of a fear of what may happen to us if we do not. This is Germany's excuse for her depredations, and if we take that position, we are no better than Germany morally. It is also ignoble to base our national action upon the interests of our country as above the interests of other countries. This again is one of the motives of Germany. We, who by our karma have been practically forced to take part in this world struggle, can through it, and the sacrifices that it entails, learn the lesson of the Brotherhood of Humanity; or, we may, when outward peace is restored, resume our former selfish national ideas, and sow the seeds for future and more terrible wars. The choice will be ours.

"To paraphrase a well-known saying, 'Now is the time for all good men and true, to come to the aid of Humanity', forgetting forever all personal and national selfishness. Now is the time to

make lasting ties of brotherhood between all peoples. We have an opportunity that does not come in many ages, to lift mankind to a higher and better basis and understanding of the purpose of life, and a far happier and progressive existence, through our world-encompassing ideals and example. We should therefore, with Arjuna, 'Resolve to fight' and to learn the lessons that the struggle presents, remembering that it is 'a glorious fight, which only fortune's favored warriors may obtain.' "

EXTRACTS FROM LUCIFER*

As far back as my twentieth year . . . . I can trace . . . . a conception which I applied to all matters of oral or written tradition . . . . the important thing is the fundamental fact, the internal force, the significance, the tendency: in this alone what is original, divine, operative, unassailable, and indestructible in the tradition, lies . . . . Any person, therefore who has occasion to occupy himself with the contents of any written tradition, must endeavour to get hold of the marrow of the matter and that not merely in the way of an intellectual cognition, but in its living relation to his own inner life, and the fruitful acton which it produces there.

Religion, properly so-called, is always a matter of the inner man, and a thing specially belonging to the individual.

People treat the divine name as if that incomprehensible and most high Being, who is even beyond the reach of thought were only their equal, otherwise they would not say the "Lord God, the *dear* God, the *good* God." If they were truly impressed by His greatness they would be dumb, and through veneration unable to name Him.

Some persons, who throughout the whole twelve months are worldly, think it necessary to be godly at a time of straits; all moral and religious matters they regard as physic, which is to be taken with aversion when they are unwell . . . . I look upon religion as a kind of diet, which can be so only when I make a constant practice of it—when throughout the whole twelve months, I never lose sight of it.

GOETHE.

He (the Sage) necessarily becomes that on which his mind is fixed. This is the eternal mystery.

The Kshetrajna,[1] which is in its essence devoid of qualities and eternal, is not to be comprehended by any symbols. Therefore the characteristic of the Kshetrajna, which is void of symbols, is purely knowledge.

ANUGITA.

---

* These Extracts were first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for March, 1891.

[1] *Kshetra-jna. The knower of the field, i. e., matter; hence the Self.*

TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE

OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY. DISCUSSIONS OF THE STANZAS OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE "SECRET DOCTRINE."

(PART TWO)

(Continued from January.)

The "Transactions" were compiled from shorthand notes taken at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society, January 10th to June 20th, 1889, and later printed in pamphlet form. Copies of this pamphlet are getting rarer with every year. THEOSOPHY is therefore reprinting the "Transactions" for the benefit of present-day students. Part II consists of Stanzas II to IV (Slokas 1 to 5) of the *"Book of Dzyan,"* upon which *"The Secret Doctrine"* is based. The answers to the questions were given by H. P. Blavatsky. Students not possessing *"The Secret Doctrine"* will find that these Stanzas are also printed in H. P. Blavatsky's *"Voice of the Silence,"* which is owned by most students, or can be purchased, through THEOSOPHY, at the nominal price of seventy-five cents, postpaid. The first part of the "Transactions" was printed in the issues of THEOSOPHY from June to October, 1916, inclusive.

VIII.

STANZA III *(continued).*

THE ROOT REMAINS, THE LIGHT REMAINS, THE CURDS REMAIN, AND STILL OEAOHOO IS ONE.

Q. What is meant by saying that these remain?

A. It means simply that whatever the plurality of manifestation may be, still it is all one. In other words these are all different aspects of the one element; it does not mean that they remain without differentiation.

"The curds are the first differentiation and probably refer to that cosmic matter which is supposed to be the origin of the 'Milky Way'—the matter we know. This 'matter', which, according to the revelation received from the primeval Dhyani-Buddhas, is, during the periodical sleep of the universe, of the ultimate tenuity conceivable to the eye of the perfect Bodhisatva—this matter, radiant and cool, becomes at the first reawakening of cosmic motion, scattered through space, appearing when seen from the earth, in clusters and lumps, like curds in thin milk. These are the seeds of future worlds, the 'star-stuff'."*

Q. Is it to be supposed that the Milky Way is composed of matter in a state of differentiation other than that with which we are acquainted?

A. I thoroughly believe so. It is the store-house of the materials from which the stars, planets and other celestial bodies

*Vol. I., p. 69, Original Edition; p. 98, Third Edition.

are produced. Matter in this state does not exist on earth; but that which is already differentiated and found on earth is also found on other planets and *vice-versâ*. But, as I understand, before reaching the planets from its condition in the Milky Way matter has first to pass through many stages of differentiation. The matter, for instance, within the Solar system is in an entirely different state from that which is outside or beyond the system.

Q. Is there a difference between the Nebulæ and the Milky Way?

A. The same, I should say, that there is between a highway road and the stones and mud upon that road. There must be, of course, a difference between the matter of the Milky Way and that of the various Nebulæ, and these again must differ among themselves. But in all your scientific calculations and measurements it is necessary to consider that the light by which the objects are seen is a *reflected* light, and the optical illusion caused by the atmosphere of the earth renders it impossible that calculations of distances, &c., should be absolutely correct, in addition to the fact that it entirely alters observations of the matter of which the celestial bodies are composed, as it is liable to impose upon us a constitution similar to that of the earth. This is, at any rate, what the MASTERS teach us.

Sloka (6). THE ROOT OF LIFE WAS IN EVERY DROP OF THE OCEAN OF IMMORTALITY (*Amrita*) AND THE OCEAN WAS RADIANT LIGHT, WHICH WAS FIRE AND HEAT AND MOTION. DARKNESS VANISHED AND WAS NO MORE. IT DISAPPEARED IN ITS OWN ESSENCE, THE BODY OF FIRE AND WATER, OF FATHER AND MOTHER.

Q. What are the various meanings of the term "fire" on the different planes of Kosmos?

A. Fire is the most mystic of all the five elements, as also the most divine. Therefore to give an explanation of its various meanings on our plane alone, leaving all the other planes entirely out of the question, would be much too arduous, in addition to its being entirely incomprehensible for the vast majority. Fire is the father of light, light the parent of heat and air (vital air). If the absolute deity can be referred to as Darkness or the Dark Fire, the light, its first progeny, is truly the first self-conscious god. For what is light in its primordial root but the world-illuminating and life-giving deity? Light is that, which from an abstraction has become a reality. No one has ever seen real or primordial light; what we see is only its broken rays or reflections, which become denser and less luminous as they descend into form and matter. Fire, therefore, is a term which comprehends ALL. Fire is the invisible deity, "the Father," and the manifesting light is God "the Son," and also the Sun. Fire—in the occult sense—is æther, and æther is born of motion, and motion is the eternal dark, invisible Fire. Light sets in motion and controls all in na-

ture, from that highest primordial æther down to the tiniest molecule in Space. MOTION is eternal *per se*, and in the manifested Kosmos it is the Alpha and Omega of that which is called electricity, galvanism, magnetism, sensation—moral and physical—thought, and even life, on this plane. Thus fire, on our plane, is simply the manifestation of motion, or life.

All cosmic phenomena were referred to by the Rosicrucians as "animated geometry." Every polar function is only a repetition of primeval polarity, said the Fire-Philosophers. For motion begets heat, and æther in motion is heat. When it slackens its motion, then cold is generated, for "cold is æther, in a latent condition." Thus the principal states of nature are three positive and three negative, synthesized by the primeval light. The three negative states are (1) Darkness; (2) Cold; (3) Vacuum or Voidness. The three positive are (1) Light (on our plane); (2) Heat; (3) All nature. Thus Fire may be called the unity of the Universe. Pure cosmic fire (without, so to speak, fuel) is Deity in its universality; for cosmic fire, or heat which it calls forth, is every atom of matter in manifested nature. There is not a thing or a particle in the Universe which does not contain in it latent fire.

Q. Fire, then, may be regarded as the first Element?

A. When we say that fire is the first of the Elements, it is the first only in the visible universe, the fire that we commonly know. Even on the highest plane of our universe, the plane of Globe A or G, fire is in one respect only the fourth. For the Occultist, the Rosecroix of the Middle Ages, and even the mediæval Kabalists, said that to our human perception and even to that of the highest "angels," the universal Deity is darkness, and from this Darkness issues the Logos in the following aspects, (1) Weight (Chaos which becomes æther in its primordial state); (2) Light; (3) Heat; (4) Fire.

Q. In what relation does the Sun, the highest form of Fire we can recognise, stand to Fire as you have explained it?

A. The Sun, as on our plane, is not even "Solar" fire. The Sun we see, gives nothing of itself, because it is a reflection; a bundle of electro-magnetic forces, one of the countless milliards of "Knots of Fohat." Fohat is called the "Thread of primeval Light," the "Ball of thread" of Ariadne, indeed, in this labyrinth of chaotic matter. This thread runs through the seven planes tying itself into knots. Every plane being septenary, there are thus forty-nine mystical and physical forces, larger knots forming stars, suns and systems, the smaller planets, and so on.

Q. In what respect is the Sun an illusion?

A. The electro-magnetic knot of our Sun is neither tangible nor dimensional, nor even as molecular as the electricity we know. The Sun absorbs, "psychisizes" and vampirizes its subjects within its system. Further than this it gives out nothing of itself. It is an absurdity, therefore, to say that the solar fires are being consumed and gradually extinguished. The Sun has but one dis-

tinct function; it gives the impulse of life to all that breathes and lives under its light. The sun is the throbbing heart of the system; each throb being an impulse. But this heart is invisible: no astronomer will ever see it. That which is concealed in this heart and that which we feel and see, its apparent flame and fires, to use a simile, are the nerves governing the muscles of the solar system, and nerves, moreover, outside of the body. This impulse is not mechanical but a purely spiritual, nervous impulse.

Q. What connection has "weight," as you use it, with gravity?

A. By weight, gravity in the occult sense of attraction and repulsion is meant. It is one of the attributes of differentiation, and is a universal property. By attraction and repulsion between matter in various states it is possible, in most cases, to explain (whereas the "law of gravitation" is insufficient to do so) the relation which the tails of the comets assume when nearing the sun; seeing that they manifestly act contrary to this hypothesis.

Q. What is the meaning of water in this connection?

A. As Water, according to its atomic weight, is composed of one-ninth of Hydrogen (a very inflammable gas, as you know, and without which no organic body is found), and of eight-ninths of Oxygen (which produces combustion when too rapidly combined with any body), what can it be but one of the forms of primordial force or fire, in a cold or latent and fluidic form? Fire bears the same relation to Water as Spirit to Matter.

Sloka (7). BEHOLD, O LANOO, THE RADIANT CHILD OF THE TWO, THE UNPARALLELED REFULGENT GLORY, BRIGHT SPACE, SON OF DARK SPACE, WHO EMERGES FROM THE DEPTHS OF THE GREAT DARK WATERS. IT IS OEAOHOO, THE YOUNGER, THE * * * *(whom thou knowest now as Kwan-Shai-Yin)*. HE SHINES FORTH AS THE SUN. HE IS THE BLAZING DIVINE DRAGON OF WISDOM. THE EKA IS CHATUR *(four)*, AND CHATUR TAKES TO ITSELF THREE, AND THE UNION PRODUCES THE SAPTA, *(Seven)* IN WHOM ARE THE SEVEN WHICH BECOME THE TRIDASA *(the thrice ten)*, THE HOSTS AND THE MULTITUDES. BEHOLD HIM LIFTING THE VEIL, AND UNFURLING IT FROM EAST TO WEST. HE SHUTS OUT THE ABOVE AND LEAVES THE BELOW TO BE SEEN AS THE GREAT ILLUSION. HE MARKS THE PLACES FOR THE SHINING ONES *(stars)* AND TURNS THE UPPER SPACE INTO A SHORELESS SEA OF FIRE, AND THE ONE MANIFESTED *(element)* INTO THE GREAT WATERS.

Kwan-Shai-Yin and Kwan-Yin are synonymous with fire and water. The two deities in their primordial manifestation are the dyadic or dual god, bi-sexual nature, Purusha and Prakriti.

Q. What are the terms corresponding to the three Logoi among the words Oeaohoo, the younger, Kwan-Shai-Yin, Kwan-

Yin, Father-Mother, Fire and Water, Bright Space and Dark Space?

A. Everyone must work this out for himself, "Kwan-Shai-Yin marks the places for the shining ones, the stars, and turns the upper space into a shoreless sea of fire, and the one manifested into the great Waters." Think well over this. Fire here stands for the concealed Spirit, Water is its progeny, or moisture, or the creative elements here on earth, the outer crust, and the evolving or creative principles within, or the innermost principles. Illusionists would probably say "above."

Q. What is the veil which Oeaohoo, the youngest, lifts from East to West?

A. The veil of reality. It is the curtain which disappears in order to show the spectator the illusions on the stage of Being, the scenery and actors, in short, the universe of MAYA.

Q. What is the "upper space" and "shoreless sea of fire?"

A. The "upper space" is the space "within," however paradoxical it may seem, for there is no *above* as no *below* in the infinitude; but the planes follow each other and solidify *from within without.* It is in fact, the universe as it first appears from its *laya* or "zero" state, a shoreless expanse of spirit, or "sea of fire."

Q. Are the "Great Waters" the same as those on which the Darkness moved?

A. It is incorrect in this case, to speak of Darkness "moving." Absolute Darkness, or the Eternal Unknown, cannot be active, and moving *is* action. Even in *Genesis* it is stated that Darkness *was* upon the face of the deep, but that which moved upon the face of the waters, was the "Spirit of God." This means esoterically that in the beginning, when the Infinitude was without form, and Chaos, or the outer Space, was still void, Darkness *(i.e., Kalahansa Parabrahm)* alone *was* Then, at the first radiation of Dawn, the "Spirit of God" (after the First and Second Logos were radiated, the Third Logos, or Narayan) began to move on the face of the Great Waters of the "Deep." Therefore the question to be correct, if not clear, should be, "Are the Great Waters the same as the Darkness spoken of?" The answer would then be in the affirmative. Kalahansa has a dual meaning. Exoterically it is Brahmâ who is the Swan, the "Great Bird," the vehicle in which Darkness manifests itself to human comprehension as light, and this Universe. But esoterically, it is Darkness itself, the unknowable Absolute which is the Source, firstly of the radiation called the First Logos, then of its reflection, the Dawn, or the Second Logos, and finally of Brahmâ, the manifested Light, or the Third Logos. Let us remember, that under this illusion of manifestation, which we see and feel, and which, as we imagine, comes under our sensuous perceptions, is simply and in sober reality, that which we neither hear, see, feel, taste nor touch at all. It is a gross illusion and nothing else.

Q. To return to an early question, in what sense can electricity be called an "entity"?

A. Only when we refer to it as Fohat, its primordial Force. In reality there is only one force, which on the manifested plane appears to us in millions and millions of forms. As said, all proceeds from the one universal primordial fire, and electricity is on our plane one of the most comprehensive aspects of this fire. All contains, and is, electricity, from the nettle which stings to the lightning which kills, from the spark in the pebble to the blood in the body. But the electricity which is seen, for instance, in an electric lamp, is quite another thing from Fohat. Electricity is the cause of the molecular motion in the physical universe, and hence also here, on earth. It is one of the "principles" of matter; for generated as it is in every disturbance of equilibrium, it becomes, so to say, the Kamic element of the object in which this disturbance takes place. Thus Fohat, the primeval cause of this force in its millions of aspects, and as the sum total of universal cosmic electricity, is an "entity."

Q. But what do you mean by this term? Is not electricity an entity also?

A. I would not call it so. The word Entity comes from the Latin root *ent,* "being," of *esse,* "to be"; therefore everything independent of any other thing, is an entity, from a grain of sand up to God. But in our case Fohat is alone an entity, electricity having only a relative significance, if taken in the usual, scientific sense.

Q. Is not cosmic electricity a son of Fohat, and are not his "Seven Sons" Entities?

A. I am afraid not. Speaking of the Sun, we may call it an Entity but we would hardly call a sunbeam that dazzles our eyes, also an Entity. The "Sons of Fohat" are the various Forces having fohatic, or cosmic electric life in their essence or being, and in their various effects. An example: rub amber—a Fohatic Entity—and it will give birth to a "Son" who will attract straws: an apparently inanimate and inorganic object thus manifesting life! But rub a nettle between your thumb and finger and you will also generate a Son of Fohat, in the shape of a blister. In these cases, the blister is an Entity, but the attraction which draws the straw, is hardly one.

Q. Then Fohat is cosmic electricity and the "Son" is also electricity?

A. Electricity is the work of Fohat, but as I have just said, Fohat is *not* electricity. From an occult standpoint, electric phenomena are very often produced by the abnormal state of the molecules of an object or of bodies in space: electricity is life and it is death: the first being produced by harmony, the second by disharmony. Vital electricity is under the same laws as Cosmic electricity. The combination of molecules into new forms, and the bringing about of new correlations and disturbance of molecular

equilibrium is, in general, the work of, and generates, Fohat. The synthesized principle, or the emanation of the seven cosmic Logoi is beneficent only there where harmony prevails.

Sloka (8). WHERE WAS THE GERM, AND WHERE WAS NOW DARKNESS? WHERE IS THE SPIRIT OF THE FLAME THAT BURNS IN THY LAMP, O LANOO? THE GERM IS THAT, AND THAT IS LIGHT; THE WHITE BRILLIANT SON OF THE DARK HIDDEN FATHER.

Q. Is the spirit of the flame that burns in the lamp of every one of us, our Heavenly Father, or Higher Self?

A. Neither one nor the other; the sentence quoted is merely an analogy and refers to a real lamp which the disciple may be supposed to be using.

Q. Are the elements the bodies of the Dhyan-Chohans, and are Hydrogen, Oxygen, Ozone and Nitrogen, the primordial elements on this plane of matter?

A. The answer to the first part of this question will be found by studying the symbolism of the *Secret Doctrine*.

With regard to the four elements named it is the case; but bear in mind that on a higher plane even volatile ether would appear to be as gross as mud. Every plane has its own denseness of substance or matter, its own colours, sounds, dimensions of space, etc., which are quite unknown to us on this plane; and as we have on earth intermediary beings, the ant for instance, a kind of transitional entity between two planes, so on the plane above us there are creatures endowed with senses and faculties unknown to the inhabitants of that plane.

There is a remarkable illustration of Elihu Vedder to the Quatrains of Omar Khayyam, which suggests the idea of the Knots of Fohat. It is the ordinary Japanese representation of clouds, single lines running into knots both in drawings and carvings. It is Fohat the "knot-tier," and from one point of view it is the "world-stuff."

Q. If the Milky Way is a manifestation of this "world-stuff" how is it that it is not seen over the whole sky?

A. Why should it not be the more contracted, and therefore, its condensed part which alone is seen. This forms into "knots" and passes through the sun-stage, the cometary and planetary stages, until finally it becomes a dead body, or a moon. There are also various kinds of suns. The sun of the solar system is a reflection. At the end of the solar manvantara, it will begin to get less and less radiant, giving less and less heat, owing to a change in the real sun, of which the visible sun is the reflection. After the solar Pralaya, the present sun will, in a future Manvantara, become a cometary body, but certainly not during the life of our little planetary chain. The argument drawn from spectrum star-analysis is not solid, because no account is taken

of the passage of light through cosmic dust. This does not mean to say that there is no real difference in the spectra of stars, but that the proclaimed presence of iron or sodium in any particular star may be owing to the modification of the rays of such a star by the cosmic dust with which the earth is surrounded.

Q. Does not the perceptive power of the ant—for instance, the way in which its perceptive faculties differ from our perceptive powers of colour—simply depend upon physiological conditions?

A. The ant can certainly appreciate the sounds that we do, and it can also appreciate sounds that we can never hear, therefore evidently, physiology has nothing whatever to do with the matter. The ant and ourselves possess different degrees of perception. We are on a higher scale of evolution than the ant, but, comparatively speaking, we are the ants to the plane above.

Q. When electricity is excited by rubbing amber, is there anything corresponding to an emanation from amber?

A. There is: the electricity which is latent in the amber, exists in everything else, and will be found there if given the appropriate conditions necessary for its liberation. There is one error which is commonly made, than which there can be no greater error in the views of an occultist. A division is made between what you call animate and inanimate objects, as if there could be such a thing as a perfectly inanimate object on earth!

In reality, even that which you call a dead man is more alive than ever. From one point of view, the distinguishing mark between what is called the organic and the inorganic is the function of nutrition, but if there were no nutrition how could those bodies which are called inorganic undergo change? Even crystals undergo a process of accretion, which for them answers the function of nutrition. In reality, as Occult philosophy teaches us, everything which changes is organic; it has the life principle in it, and it has all the potentiality of the higher lives. If, as we say, all in nature is an aspect of the one element, and life is universal, how can there be such a thing as an inorganic atom!

AUTHORITY

There lie open before me the "Holy Bible," the "Light of Asia," and the "Bhagavad-Gita." What does anyone living today know of Jesus, or Buddha, or Krishna? Nothing. What need we know of such personalities? Nothing. So we are left face to face with the naked statements which reach us through such books. We read and study them and form our own judgments as to their inherent value. What is it that judges? It is the child of omniscient Spirit, our Soul, our Self in a material body; and though still a child, his birth-rights can not be usurped, or delegated, or evaded in any way.

"OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH"

THEOSOPHY has received a copy of a circular letter sent out under date of November 1, 1917, by *The Sacramental Church of the Living Christ* (*Old Catholic*), requesting our help and contributions "to launch this conception of the great eternal truths before the American people." To this we must reply that that we are not interested in launching our own or any one else's "conception of the great eternal truths." We *are* interested in launching those great eternal truths themselves. We are no whit interested in launching the conception of the Old Catholic Church, or the Campbellite church, or any other church or sect or creed or party. Why not? Simply because they are nothing but conceptions, *i.e.*, interpretations, speculations, opinions, dogmas. What the world needs and desperately needs is the eternal truths themselves. Of "conceptions" erroneous and partial and distorted, as all renderings are, the world has, and has always had, a superabundance.

The same circular invites us to attend the "first celebration of the Mass." which will be "held in Besant Hall (Chicago) on Sunday, November 18, 1917, at 11 A.M.," and says that 60,000,000 of our people "have no church affiliations, because no religion has been presented to them allowing them intellectual freedom." Is this latter statement in any way true? We do not think so. We think the great majority of adult Americans have no church affiliations because the churches offer them no *intellectual food*, rather than no "intellectual freedom." There is entire religious liberty in all the churches. Every one has "intellectual *freedom*" in religious matters. He may read or not read, propagate or not propagate, accept or reject, any or all the "conceptions" of eternal truths afloat. The fact that 60 millions do not accept any of the "conceptions" offered is proof of their "intellectual freedom." As to the others, the existence in every city and town of representatives of the most bizarre and antagonistic "conceptions" is certainly abundant evidence that the remainder of the population has "intellectual freedom" to do as they think fit. If they want to "join" any sect, nothing and no one prevents. If they want to transfer their allegiance, or absolve themselves entirely, nothing and no one hinders. And the statement that "no religion has been presented to them allowing any intellectual freedom" is not only devoid of truth, but is filled with a monstrous falsehood, for THEOSOPHY and the three Objects of The original Theosophical Society *have* been presented to them these many years, offering the fullest measure both of intellectual freedom and of intellectual food, as any one may know who studies Theosophy or peruses the three Objects of the Society founded by H. P. B. These statements in the circular are not "conceptions" of the facts: they are misconceptions of the most glaring and indefensible kind.

And the "conceptions" of "Baptism and Confirmation, Holy Orders, the taking of Holy Communion" are equally glaring misconceptions of the facts; misrepresentations, to speak more coldly accurately though less politely, for the circular quotes the "Rev." *(sic)* J. I. Wedgewood, Founder of this Old Catholic Church, as authority for the statement that these mummeries—Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Orders, Holy Communion—were "planned" by "the Master of the Masters of Wisdom."

There are in existence in public print, as well as otherwise, a considerable number of messages from the Masters of Wisdom of unquestioned and undisputed authenticity. They cover a wide range of ethics, philosophy and science as well as facts. Not only is there nothing in any of these messages to lend color to such statements as we have quoted, but there is everything to warrant their entire rejection. The whole teachings of Theosophy as recorded by H.P.B. and Mr. Judge give the lie utter and complete to any such abominable pretensions to knowledge or authority as are contained in this circular, and the open and easily accessible facts, as we have shown, bear out the real messages of the Masters and the real teachings of Theosophy on the subjects mentioned. Theosophy was presented to give the actual eternal truths themselves, not any one's conceptions, and to afford intellectual food and freedom, the only "true aid to spiritual progress." And the Theosophical Society was founded to be "the corner-stone of the future religion of Humanity" by those very Masters Themselves.

And again, *The Old Catholic Church* is a misnomer and a forgery, not a "conception," as may easily be determined from the fact that it is neither "old" nor "catholic." These two words have definite and precise meanings attached to them. The "Old Catholic Church" is not five years old. And "catholic" means the chair of the Vatican and nothing else in any such connection as this. The "Old Catholic Church" is fraudulent, spurious, and a forgery in fact, in assumptions, in claims and in pretensions. It is a mere cuckoo. It will doubtless find its nest and lay its eggs in many a trusting but foolish, credulous and ambitious heart; as other Catholic churches and other "conceptions" have stolen what fire they could from the altar of the living Christ, and from the teachings of the Masters wherewith to make their own merchandise and ensnare the unwary who might be tempted to purchase stolen goods at a price.

In the years that have gone by since 1895, many have joined Mrs. Besant's Theosophical Society, only to leave it when they found out by dear and bitter experience the abysmal gulf between its claims and its nutriment. The Old Catholic Church, spawned within the womb of like pretense and abuse of sacred names is a fitting progeny of its unhallowed parent, and we welcome it, for it will have one lasting and beneficial effect: it will tend to open the eyes and save many members of Mrs. Besant's society by its very crudity and enormity; they will leave her society and seek intel-

lectual freedom and spiritual progress in the study and practice of the eternal truths presented by H.P.B., not in the perversions and distortions which they have hitherto accepted, because they honestly and innocently supposed them to be part of the eternal Wisdom-Religion.

STUDY OR SEARCH?*

From Adelphi.

A most perplexed individual is writing to you. I have been for three years endeavoring to study Theosophy. I have heard lectures, have read an immense amount of literature devoted to that cult, from the sages of old down to the Sinnetts, Olcotts, and Blavatskys of the present day. I have conned the Yoga Philosophy and I read *The Path*. Light on the Path aids me not, nor does Bhagavad-Gita, and why? Because I am yet without the first steps towards practice. (Surely Theosophy—like other sciences—must have *something* practical about it?) Guide me with your friendly hints. Imagine me alone in a room. How to commence? Show me the first step upon the practical ladder! All I have heard and read seemeth to me so elaborately unintelligible that I lay it aside and beg you to instruct me in my Theosophical A B C. Astral Light! Is it a figurative light, *i. e.* Revelation? or is it a light, as electricity—the Heavens—coal—gives light? If abstraction (into insensibility) is necessary, can you instruct me upon Hypnotism (self mesmerism.)? "A shining object" is advised to stare at! A mirror is a shining object, for instance. But of what avail to stare at a mirror and see reflected ugliness!

Answer—You say that for three years you have been endeavoring to *study* Theosophy. Such being the case, you will meet with but little success. Divine Wisdom can not be a subject for *study*, but it may be an object of *search*. With the love for this same wisdom uppermost in our hearts, we ask you if it would not be wiser to lay aside the *study* of so called Theosophy and study yourself. Knowing yourself you know all men, the worlds seen and occult, and find Theo-Sophia. One cannot absorb Theosophy as a sponge does water, to be expelled at the slightest touch. Our conception of Theosophy is apt to be based upon the idea that it is an especial line of teaching—a larger, wider, and greater doctrine than others perhaps, but still a doctrine, and therefore limited. We must bear in mind that the true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect, yet belongs to each and all; that he can find the true object of his search equally as well in the Hebrew bible as in the Yoga philosophy, in the New Testament equally as well as in the Bhagavad-Gita.

---

* Portion of an article first printed by Wm. Q. Judge, as *"Answers to Questioners,"* in *The Path* of February, 1888. The title used above is our own.—[Ed. Theosophy.]

You say you have "conned the Yoga philosophy." This is not enough; merely to "con" it is not to know it. It is in fact a most practical system (if you refer to that of Patanjali), and one that will meet all requirements you have in the way of difficulty; for it is one of the most difficult. It is not possible for you to judge its merits without practice: and it gives full directions. If for three years you study and practice it—aye for one year—, you will find that you need no other. In these matters there is no child's play nor the usual English and American method of mere book-learning,—we must absorb and work into the practice and the theory laid down, for they are not written merely for the *intellect*, but for the whole spiritual nature. There must be within the man something which he already knows, that leaps up and out when he scans the books of wisdom; a thing already existing, which only takes an added life or confirmation from books. True Theosophy has all that is practical, but many forget this; there is no greater system of practice than that required by it.

Desire wisdom; love all men; do your duty; forget yourself; let each thought and act of your life have for its aim the finding of divine wisdom; strive to apply that wisdom for the good of other men. If you search in every direction, Light must come to you. Let the place in which you now are be the lonely room you speak of, and seek to find in everything the meaning. Strive to know what they are, and by what governed or caused. This is the first step. Live your life with this ever before you. Purify your thought as well as your body. Reason all you can, feel all with your heart you may, and when intellect and heart fail you, seek for something higher. This is the A. B. C.; it is enough for the present.

It is not Theosophy that is a science, but its application. It is not a "cult," for it covers and includes all.

The Astral Light is an actuality. It is not revelation, but a means through which that which causes revelation acts. Electricity, the heavens, all lower fires, are but the shadows of the Astral Light, just as the Astral Light is but the darkness of the Ineffable Light.

Abstraction into insensibility is not intended. If it had been so intended it would be unnecessary for us to be in these bodies. If you can forget yourself sufficiently—forget that you exist as a human body, you will not need to stare at a mirror; but so long as you realize, when staring into a glass, whether you be pretty or ugly, you can not reach Celestial sensibility or terrestrial insensibility.

Hypnotism is the controlling of other personalities. Under this you would be but a puppet for the thought of another. Your outer self had better become a puppet for your own thought.

We seek to make the body alive, not to kill it.

ZADOK.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

At the regular meetings of The United Lodge of Theosophists it is a custom to devote a part of the time to "Question and Answer." Questions on the subject of the evening's talk, or suggested by it, are asked by Members or Inquirers in the audience and answered by the Speaker, or by some well-versed Student who is called upon for this service. Printed below are some Questions and Answers, taken stenographically at some of the meetings when the book, "The Ocean of Theosophy", by Wm. Q. Judge, was being studied and discussed.

Q. Just what is meant in Chapter I by, "All is soul and spirit?"

A. "All is soul and spirit ever evolving under the rule of law which is inherent in the whole." Everything is spirit, everything is soul. Spirit is universal. It can't be said to belong to anybody or anything. It is like the air—universal, abstract. It cannot know itself except as soul. Spirit is the power to become. Soul is the becoming. Spirit is the power to see and to know. The seeing and the knowing is the soul. Soul is the accumulation of perceptions and experiences by means of which spiritual identity is realized.

Q. What is meant by "Nature"? It speaks of "Great Nature," Human Nature, etc.

A. Nature is the inter-action and inter-relation of all the beings of all kingdoms, from the first and lowest elemental kingdoms up to the highest Dhyan Chohan. It is the inter-action and inter-relation of all beings that constitute what are called "Nature's laws."

Q. The statement is made that "Masters are perfected men from former periods of evolution." Does this mean that there have been none since?

A. Every civilization adds to their number.

Q. It speaks in the Third Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine* of action having reached a certain point, it becomes self-induced and self-devised. What point is meant?

A. From self-consciousness on, it is self-induced and self-devised.

Q. In Chapter II what does it mean by "Great Being"?

A. By "Great Being" is meant the sum of all being—humanity, *Manu*, the great Man. Humanity. A representative of the highest intelligence of a humanity is a *Manu*. When any unit has obtained the highest intelligence of his humanity, then he finds other fields before him.

Q. Does the word "Man" come from the Sancrit word *Manu* —the Thinker?

A. Certainly it does. See *Glossary*.

Q. What does it mean to see an active image of one who is gone who was very close to you—to see this image recurring always active?

A. The "Image" in mind and body during the time it was with you changed constantly. Now is it the image as you last remembered it or during any other period of its growth? Had it remained in life for a number of years longer, the image would have been different. By this fact we may see that the image remembered presents only *our* focus of touch and understanding with the Ego who inhabited that body. Yet, at the same time, it constitutes an actual touch with and relation to that Ego. This is a door through which influence and help can come between the two Egos involved. The nearer we come to grasping the egoic nature of all being, the greater the influx and the stronger the relation. The Image is the point of thought contact with the Ego.

Q. Does cremation give the Ego any spiritual knowledge?

A. The death of the body means a return of the lives of the body to their respective elements. In cremation this return is immediate. The Ego then has no point of physical contact with the physical world and is free to work out and assimilate the experiences of the life last lived. It has only that knowledge which it has already acquired. No change of state can give knowledge, for knowledge is gained only through the observation and experience of the Ego. There is great benefit to the living in the restoration of the elements without their going through the slow process of decomposition. When considered from every point of view, cremation is beneficial. There is a psychological effect from it, too, on those who are left behind; for as soon as cremation is completed the bereaved at once feel the release.

Q. "The universe evolves from the unknown, into which no man or mind however high, can inquire, on seven planes or in seven ways or methods." Will you state the meaning of that "seven ways?"

A. At the beginning of a great period of evolution there is already existing all that was gained in the previous periods of evolution. This knowledge and power, sometimes called "the three hypostases of *Atman*," manifests in seven ways. This manifestation consists of seven hierarchies of beings which express themselves *successively* in seven stages of substance—each stage of which has seven sub-divisions, as well as minor divisions; this septenary nature of being is expressed in every form, condition, substance and relation from the highest to the lowest.

Examples: seven globes; seven principles; seven races; seven sub-races; seven colors; seven rounds, etc. (Ref. *S.D.* I: 289, 290, 291, 292, orig. Edition; 309, 310, 311, 3rd Edition.)

Q. On page seventeen we have mention of the British inch. To what does that refer?

A. Piazzi Smyth was a F.R.A.S., who investigated, studied and made measurements of the Great Pyramid. Being a very patriotic Englishman, as well as a very orthodox Christian, he evolved and promulgated the theory that the geometric measurements of the Great Pyramid proved that the scientific basis of its construction was to demonstrate that the British inch, and not the metric system, is the true standard of lineal measurements; and further that the religious purpose in building the Pyramid was to enforce the orthodox idea of the Sabbath and as a warning against the Continental Sunday.

Q. Page 14, what does it mean, "Until all the units which are ready are perfected?"

A. There is always a certain proportion of human beings who have had sufficient experience to carry them into a higher stream of evolution, leaving the best of those who have not advanced so far to take their places. They never leave until others have been raised to take their places. Perfected beings exemplify universal brotherhood, that being their acquired nature. All is under law, nothing is left to chance. The higher the being, the more fully is the law of brotherhood expressed. One wouldn't expect those who came from the animal kingdom on the moon as incipient humanity to have had the same experience as those who were self-conscious when the earth began. There are always those who pass out of any system through advancement and those who remain to perfect their experience, while still others come in from the kingdoms below.

Q. In regard to septenary nature, when a being is perfected here does he begin at the bottom on a higher sphere? In other words, there are only seven principles: is it a continuous going through them in the scale of perfectibility?

A. When you perfect yourself in the septenary degree of any evolution, then you have the basis for a septenary evolution of a much higher kind. (For example, the difference between our planet, the earth, and Venus.)

Q. It is said a knowledge of the Three Fundamental Propositions of *The Secret Doctrine* gives a means of solution to every problem of life. How could a knowledge of the "Fundamentals" help me to determine whether I should go to war or not?

A. The Three Fundamental Propositions show one thing: that the aim of existence and evolution is the right progress of all beings. Everything tending to justice, human freedom and progression, is a right basis for action. Even in the first "Fundamental" one gets the general motive. Applying that motive particularly, one asks: "What is my duty in taking part in any individual or collective action?" Our moral support should be given to every right action, even if we cannot help more actively. But, if we can actively help, we should do so. Under the second

"Fundamental" there is the Law of Periodicity: that means the return of individuals who work out the effects of causes produced by them. Under this comes all the karmic settlements between nations. If we belong to a nation which goes to war, that makes it our duty to act with that nation so far as its government is disposed to act for general human betterment. If our nation is at peace, then our support should go to that nation which is striving to bring about the best results for humanity at large and, in this determination, the liking for one nation more than another should not enter. It is entirely a question of human progression and the best means to that end. This calls for discrimination and each must find that for himself. The "Third Fundamental" indicates that the Universe is composed of beings of every grade, and that among mankind there are many degrees of development and understanding. So we must always take into consideration the general principles and ideals that govern any man and any nation.

Q. What is patience, Theosophically considered?

A. Consideration for others. An undisturbed condition of mind, a steadiness and a quietness in regard to any thing that comes to pass. This leaves our best judgment ready for action.

Q. Page 15, Chapter II, "The first differentiation, speaking metaphysically as to time, is Spirit." What does that mean?

A. Time can be reckoned only by action and reaction, and until there is action, there is no time. Before there is any time there must be the spiritual entities coming out of the homogeneous state into activity. The phrase means: "Time" was not until these spiritual entities began to act. Time means the beginning of action and establishes the cycles. (See *S. D.* I—Stanza I.)

Q. Do not all the good thoughts sent out by these people who pray for the unfortunates of the war do good, some good, at least, to those who are prayed for?

A. We are still imbued with the old fallacy of praying to some outside power or being. Neither prayers to any supposed God or Masters even, are of any avail. Power either exists *within*, or not at all. All the power that any being exerts or can exert in any direction is what he himself is able to arouse within himself. Good and kind thoughts for others are good for those who think them, but they have no effect outside, unless the arouser of those thoughts has both the knowledge, will and power to direct them; and beings differ greatly in these. Most thoughts are like soap-bubbles and do not travel very far. Thoughts to be effective must not only be free from all selfish taint, but they must be sustained. The Masters, who of all beings are the most capable of sustained thought and have the power and knowledge, are not able to affect the minds of the people of the world, because those minds are constantly full of active, selfish thoughts. If Masters were able to affect humanity by their thoughts, they wouldn't have to write books. If people, who can hear and read words intended

to arouse the best in them. benefit so little by them, what hope is there in fugitive thinking?

The most powerful wireless, capable of sending messages all over the world, would be a most useless expenditure of force unless there were receiving stations attuned to the sending one. If we think kindly of another and that other is in a receptive mood, the thought will reach; but who is able to tell when the object of his thought will be receptive?

As the parable says, "First make clean the inside of the platter," before we try to serve wholesome food. The best help we can give others, and the most power we can acquire, is by getting rid of our defects, by subduing the personality, and giving play to our spiritual forces and faculties. Then there will be power and knowledge as to when, where and how to act or to refrain from the action-producing thoughts.

Q. Chapter III—Why is it that we are so much behind what we were thousands of years ago, spiritually?

A. Because the consciousness engaged in external things caused the intellect, the power of reasoning from premises to conclusions, to grow at the expense of the spiritual, direct knowledge. We were so busy learning the characteristics of matter that the consciousness of being spirit was lost. We have aroused desire for external things and these lead directly away from the consciousness of being spirit.

There is a spiritual aroma in every pleasing thing, so we seek aromas. forgetting the nature of our being, and this pursuit is purposeless and endless. Unless we attain to the consciousness of spiritual being (a purposeful existence in spirit not in matter) we remain bound by the conditions of physical existence.

This so-called "descent" was necessary in order for us to know matter in its various divisions and phases—in other words, to understand the nature of other and smaller lives. The real purpose is not achieved by eternally living among them and upon them; and desire arises from pursuing what is pleasant among them and avoiding the unpleasant. Nature is composed of heterogeneous lives. In using them we pursue those which are homogeneous with our acquired nature and endeavor to avoid those that are not. From this, desire and aversion arise.

Intellect comes from seeing differences and comparing them. Intellect once gained may be used to perpetuate material existence, or as an instrument of the spirit in guiding and controlling the lower lives of this plane.

Q. Why is it that animals have keener senses than man?

A. Because we have added intellect to them and dulled them by excess of use or depended on our perceptions rather than our senses. The latter become dulled by lack of dependence on them. Consider smell, for instance; we don't smell a person out. The animals depend upon their senses; we smell so many things merely as pleasant or unpleasant, without regard to the psychology

of them, that we have lost the range which comes from deeper perceptions.

Q. Would "permeability" mean that any one sense would perform the functions of all the others?

A. "Permeability" is the seeing back beyond the appearance of a thing to the nature that caused that appearance. Take a stone, for example: the first thing that strikes you in a stone is its density. For most people one stone is just like another stone. But the mineralogist knows the differences by separation of the particles. Chemistry goes still farther; it gets the different qualities in the stone and shows its constituent parts—the various kinds of elements that make it up. But all these are physical. "Permeability" not only gives all that mineralogy and chemistry give, but discloses the essential nature which is the basis of each physical expression. It determines the nature of the various conscious beings that compose the stone, and there are many such classes.

Or consider a tree, for instance: first the tree is seen with its trunk, branches, leaves and what not; then the tree within the bark, the veins of the tree; then the various arteries through which the sap, the blood of the tree, flows; then the pulsation of the heart of the tree in the root, which causes the circulation of the blood (sap) to flow, and then the nature of the lives that cause the expression of the tree—thus bringing gradually the sense of the *feeling* of the nature of the being, which we call "tree." That is "permeability" carried to its highest point. In its lower degrees it might stop short at any point—one might see only a portion of these qualities.

Or consider the point of view of a speaker to an audience: those present are all *see-ers*; but while they all see him, he doesn't see them all, and for the time being he acts as a synthetic consciousness. There is always a guiding consciousness over all the smaller lives, and the guiding consciousness which expresses itself in that way is called "tree,"—guiding all the lives that express themselves in bark, sap, root, blossoms and fruit. "The eyes of the Highest see through the eyes of the lowest."

If the process is once carried out with the tree, to whatever extent we may be able to carry it, the reflection of a tree upon our visual organ will always carry with it that sense of life and being which we have gained of it. Seeing, with us, has two aspects—one is the mere reflection of the thing seen, with little or no sense of its nature; the other deeper aspect,—a small, greater or full perception of the *nature* of the object which causes the reflection. Every object seen presents life and being in their many phases. We ought, however, to apply our understanding to the hearts of men. The root of all being is the same, knowledge. Thus, in man especially, we should seek for that point where differentiation begins and trace the inevitable outcome. We can do this best in our own hearts with what we see in others as *our* landmarks or indications.

Q. What is a "Round"? Would circling round the seven centers of consciousness mean seven times on one plane of substance? Or what constitutes a "center of consciousness?"

A. A "Round" is one circling through the seven centers of consciousness. Each kind of substance is a center of consciousness, just as the physical plane is a center for us now. Though there are but four planes, on re-ascending to the next plane above where we are, our store of consciousness has been added to, through experience, so that it becomes a new and different center —although on the same plane. (A real new plane, because we have a new outlook entirely.)

The seven great centers of consciousness pertain to the seven original hierarchies of being; these, by differentiating substance, create a new center of consciousness and so on from state to state through the seven rounds or states of substance and consciousness.

On the re-ascent we work in the substance in a different way, owing to the added experience. For instance, you return to a place after being away from it. You look at it from a different point of view; so every thing in that place has a different relation to you.

SECRET DOCTRINE EXTRACTS*

. . . Those tribes of savages, whose reasoning powers are very little above the level of the animals, are not the unjustly disinherited, or the *unfavoured,* as some may think—nothing of the kind. They are simply those *latest arivals* among the human Monads, which *were not ready*: which have to evolve during the present Round, as on the three remaining globes (hence on four different planes of being) so as to arrive at the level of the average class when they reach the Fifth Round. One remark may prove useful, as food for thought to the student in this connection. The MONADS of the lowest specimens of humanity (the "narrow-brained"[1] savage South-Sea Islander, the African, the Australian) *had no Karma to work out when first born as men, as their more favoured brethren in intelligence had.* The former are spinning out Karma only now; the latter are burdened with past, present, and future Karma. In this respect the poor savage is more fortunate than the greatest genius of *civilised countries.*

---

* From the Original Edition Vol. II, p. 168; see Vol. II, pp. 177-178 Third Edition.

[1] The term here means neither the dolicho-cephalic nor the brachyo-cephalic, nor yet skulls of a smaller volume, but simply brains devoid of intellect generally. The theory which would judge of the intellectual capacity of a man according to his cranial capacity, seems absurdly illogical to one who has studied the subject. The skulls of the stone period, as well as those of African Races (Bushmen included) show that the first are above rather than below the average of the brain capacity of the modern man, and the skulls of the last are on the whole (as in the case of Papuans and Polynesians generally) larger by one cubic inch than that of the average Frenchman. Again, the cranial capacity of the Parisian of to-day represents an average of 1437 cubic centimètres compared to 1523 of the Auvergnat.

AROUND THE TABLE

IT had been a very quiet Christmas day for the Family. With Big Brother in Service, and Student banished to the mountains upon Doctor's orders for the length of her vacation recess, it didn't "seem like Christmas at all", Mother remarked more than once as the day progressed. Christmas dinner was a very simple affair indeed, save for a real plum pudding, prepared out of regard for Mentor's Canadian ancestry.

"Let's sit and chat awhile", said Mother, when dessert was finished. "Anna is out for the evening, so there is no hurry to clear away".

"Well, the usual Christmas orgy is about over for this year, isn't it?" remarked Doctor, pushing back his chair and crossing his legs comfortably. "The down-town streets yesterday reminded me of nothing so much as an active mob scene".

"That's putting it rather strongly", said Mentor, with a smile, "but Christmas does seem to be made a time of strain and rush—and quite unnecessarily so."

"It's the indiscriminate giving, isn't it, Mentor, that makes most of the trouble?" asked Spinster thoughtfully.

"No doubt of it", was the answer.

"But we ought to remember there's a whole lot of kindness and good feeling behind much of the strain and effort," put in Mother, "even if it is perhaps misapplied."

"Good motive, but not much knowledge", answered Mentor, "that's true of many things done which were better left undone. You see, good motive is not enough", he continued earnestly. "The Inquisition used to burn men's bodies in order to save their souls The motive was good but the results were not—that is certain".

"It's all right, Mother, for you to look for the kindness and good feeling that animates the Christmas nonsense", said Doctor, shaking a playful finger at her across the table. "Of course you'd see that side of it because that's the way you yourself feel; but there are just as many, or even more, who do not feel that way. They give because they think they have to, or because they know others will give to them—or even in order to get a return, or because they want to be thought well of".

"What an arraignment of our human kind, Doctor"! exclaimed Spinster, with a little shiver.

"But isn't it true, Mentor?" persisted the Doctor, who enjoys an argument now and then, though his old-time aggressiveness of speech, and tenacity or obstinacy of opinion, has been greatly toned down since he began sincerely to apply Theosophy *to himself*.

"Of course it's true," answered Mentor, with a whimsical wink for Spinster, "but Mother is right, too, you must remember. There are worthy motives in giving, and unworthy motives too. There

are times and seasons in gift giving like anything else. And wisdom is needed in these things—a standard by which we can judge what we ought and ought not to do. Do you remember that passage in the *Bhagavad-Gita*," he added, turning to Spinster—"Seventeenth Chapter, I think?"

"Yes, and I wish everybody could know it, and know how to apply it too", she replied: "'Those gifts which are bestowed at the proper time to the proper person, and by men who are not desirous of a return, are of the *sattva* quality, good and of the nature of truth. But that gift which is given with the expectation of a return from the beneficiary or with a view to spiritual benefit flowing therefrom or with reluctance, is of the *rajas* quality, bad and partaketh of untruth. Gifts given out of place and season and to unworthy persons, without proper attention and scornfully, are of the *tamas* quality, wholly bad and of the nature of darkness'".

"There you have it", said Mentor, with an approving nod for Spinster's good memory. "One needs knowledge if he is to give wisely; and it is only by knowing and applying the standard that Theosophy presents that such knowledge can be gained. It's a discrimination, an understanding of, as well as a compassion for, all others that is most sorely needed."

"Good old *Gita*," said the Doctor thoughtfully. "It always seems to hit the nail on the head, doesn't it?"

"It certainly does", answered Mentor vigorously. "Mr. Judge used to say it was the study of Adepts, and it is one of the most necessary books for the student who would acquire the wisdom in action which Krishna teaches."

"Would you say it was the 'Theosophy' of its day, Mentor"? asked Mother.

"Yes, that would be correct in one sense", was the answer. "But it's equally for today and for all time—a portion of the old Wisdom-Religion given out by that Teacher, and coming down to us intact—whereas most of the pure old teachings reach us so mutilated as to be almost unrecognizable".

"Somebody at the Theosophical Rooms the other day said that the philosophy came from the *Gita* and other old writings, and was just 'put together' by H. P. B.", remarked Spinster rather aggrievedly, "and it was an old student at that. Of course I said it wasn't so, but I fear I didn't bring out the right idea very well. What would you say to such a statement, Mentor—just what is the Source?"

"It's a fact that people do have all sorts of notions about the Source of Theosophy", interrupted Doctor. "An old scholar I know told me the other day it came from the *Vedas*, and I have heard several students say that Theosophy came from India. What is the best way to meet such statements", he added, turning himself around in his chair so he could face his old friend.

"One at a time, please", answered Mentor with a smile. "You say, Spinster, that an 'old student' told you something as to the

Source. What do you mean by the phrase 'old student', merely one who has been studying Theosophy for some years? In that sense the phrase is a misnomer. No one who was *really* an 'old student'—by which I mean an *advanced* student—would ever make the mistake the one you mention made. An 'old student' is not one who has just studied Theosophy for a number of years in *this* life, but a person who by his speech and example shows that he really *knows* something of Theosophy, though in this life he may have studied it but a relatively short time.

"And now as to the Source: the statements mentioned are not true", he continued. "And it is necessary that every sincere and grateful student should be able to meet them, and others of their kind, in an effective way. Questions like 'What is the Source' are often rather contemptuously considered 'elementary' by Theosophical students. Ask them about Karma or Reincarnation, the 'Sheaths of the Soul', or even the evolution of the earth and they might be able to give a somewhat lengthy, if not very logical, answer. But a question of the Source is too 'elementary' to interest them particularly—in fact many Theosophical students have not given it any special attention, though we can at once see, as soon as our notice is directed to it, that this 'primary concept' is of the utmost importance. For *if* Theosophy is the truth about life, both as a whole and in all its particularities of manifestation, we must have an idea of the reliability and worthiness of the Source, and a definite understanding of just what that Source is, if we are to present a logical and explainable answer to those who ask us reasons for the faith and conviction that are in us.

"Theosophy did not and does not come 'from India', though undoubtedly some of those who dwelt in what we now call India knew Theosophy, and some few now dwelling in that country know it today. There are in India some three hundred different and differing religious sects, with their doctrines, systems, priests and followers. There are likewise a few thousand students of Theosophy, and perhaps a few real Theosophists—that is, those who know and live in accordance with the teachings of Theosophy. But modern India is even more sectarian than the Europe or the United States of today. So it cannot truly be said that Theosophy 'comes from India'.

"Nor does Theosophy come from the old *Vedas* or the *Gita*, though both undoubtedly 'came from' the teaching that in our day we call Theosophy. These old writings are in effect that portion of the ancient Wisdom-Religion which was given out by the beings who knew it, at that time and to that people. Some part of this was transcribed by the teachers and students of that time, and this transcription we call the *Vedas*. One who really *knows* Theosophy would doubtless find it in the *Vedas;* but the enquirer unfamiliar with Theosophy might spend a lifetime upon the *Vedas* without ever becoming able to work out a synthetic philosophy of life such as Theosophy presents.

"Then what is the Source of Theosophy? The Source for us is the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, the Messenger of our day; and the writings of Wm. Q. Judge as well. For she presented the Philosophy, as a system, and he showed its practical application to everyday life. These two acted as the Agents of the Masters of Wisdom—conscious Agents, who themselves possessed the knowledge as is abundantly proved by the internal evidence of the writings. The ultimate Source is therefore the Masters Themselves—men who have learned through observation and experience in many lives and ages the meaning and purpose of life itself, and have so perfected Their instruments for contacting life upon any and all planes of being that nothing is hidden from Them and They know what there is to know. Through the Teachers named, Masters gave out to the world, under the name 'Theosophy', that portion of the Ancient Wisdom which They deemed assimilable by the minds of men in our day. 'It is wisdom about God for those who believe that he is all things and in all, and wisdom about nature for the man who accepts the statement found in the Christian Bible that God cannot be measured or discovered'; 'a knowledge of the laws which govern the evolution of the physical, astral, psychical, and intellectual constituents of nature and of man'. Therefore what could be the Source of Theosophy other than the statements of Those who Themselves have consciously acquired the knowledge.

"The Masters do not themselves reside in India. They are not Eastern nor Western, but Universal. That They exist is well known to some who, having proven for themselves the truth of the teachings of Theosophy, have complied with the conditions necessary for contact with such Beings. But belief and blind faith in Masters is not essential to the student or enquirer who would test out the philosophy of Theosophy and its Source. Abundant evidence as to the existence of beings wiser than man is to be found in all religions, in history,—and in myth and tradition which are in fact much more reliable than written 'history'. Furthermore, if one would really *know,* let him examine the philosophy merely from an intellectual point of view and in the light of cold reason; and the conviction will inevitably come home to him that here is a 'system', to use a word, that really agrees with itself and with the facts of life: that from self-evident bases through the balanced course of logical reasoning and objective proof 'checks up' in every particular. Once this is seen, the Source is implied. We cannot affirm the truth of the philosophy and deny the existence of Those who know it. The word 'knowledge' implies something known, and as knowledge does not exist of itself, there must always be KNOWERS.

"Then what is the Source of Theosophy? The Masters of Wisdom, the Knowers of Theosophy. Not any place, nor any book or books, but conscious, living men whose equally conscious Agents ---H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge—have written down the very words and sentences by which we may come ourselves to know

the book of life. Books are necessary to us in order that an intellectual grasp of the philosophy may be had; and so the books have been given us. They are the chart, but *we* must do the travelling. Recognition of the Source, and gratitude toward it, are the first steps in moving upon that Path."

* * * * * * * * *

The Family sat quiet for a time after Mentor had finished; for when he speaks of the Teachers, and the Great Ones who are behind, there is in his voice a certain ring of conviction that seems to "bring home" to those who listen some sense of the reality of it all.

"Quite a lecture", he said at last, smiling a little; and then, more earnestly, "but in Theosophy everything depends upon the right 'approach'. If the Source is not recognized, the gain from the study of the philosophy is almost altogether intellectual and not spiritual at all, and the student will never sense the reality behind the written words. No man ever 'found himself' alone, nor can anybody acquire real knowledge without help; and how can he receive help if he does not know of whom or how to ask it? A grateful recognition of the *living* Source is really the first step—and students ought to know that, and dwell on the idea.

"But we started to talk of Christmas gifts and giving, didn't we, Family", he added, rising from his chair. "Let's go into the living-room and open the packages I saw Mother and Spinster laying out for us in there—when they didn't know I was looking. I left two or three myself after you went out, just so you wouldn't think I was getting to be a forgetful old man, Spinster dear . . . come on, I want to see you open them".

"I just know that the gifts *you* make are 'bestowed at the proper time to the proper person' and that you are 'not desirous of a return', Mentor", said Spinster softly as the Family moved through the folding doors. "I tried to make those I gave of that kind this year—'of the *sattva* quality, good and of the nature of truth.'"

CANNED GOODS

The printing press may become a machine for destroying original thought, as well as our taste for fresh food. We live too much on canned goods. Our Libraries are stacked full of canned Science, canned Philosophy, canned Religion,—everything under the Sun is now canned. Lacking preservative much of the stuff is rotten and should be thrown out, and many cans have nothing in them—never had. The Art of intelligent discussion, of polite conversation, of connected reasoning, is being crowded out by trivialities. Yet the heavens and the earth, the seas and all that in them is, are as full of fresh meat today as they were before ever a line had been written about any thing in them.

THE MIND IN NATURE*

By H. P. Blavatsky.

GREAT is the self-satisfaction of modern science, and unexampled its achievements. Pre-christian and mediæval philosophers may have left a few landmarks over unexplored mines: but the discovery of all the gold and priceless jewels is due to the patient labours of the modern scholar. And thus they declare that the genuine, real knowledge of the nature of the Kosmos and of man is all of recent growth. The luxuriant modern plant has sprung from the dead weeds of ancient superstitions.

Such, however, is not the view of the students of Theosophy. And they say that it is not sufficient to speak contemptuously of "the untenable conceptions of an uncultivated past," as Mr. Tyndall and others have done, to hide the intellectual quarries out of which the reputations of so many modern philosophers and scientists have been hewn. How many of our distinguished scientists have derived honour and credit by merely dressing up the ideas of those old philosophers, whom they are ever ready to disparage, is left to an impartial posterity to say. But conceit and self-opinionatedness have fastened like two hideous cancers on the brains of the average man of learning; and this is especially the case with the Orientalists-Sanskritists, Egyptologists and Assyriologists. The former are guided (or perhaps only pretend to be guided) by post-Mahâbhâratian commentators; the latter by arbitrarily interpreted papyri, collated with what this or the other Greek writer said, or passed over in silence, and by the cuneiform inscriptions on half-destroyed clay tablets copied by the Assyrians from "Accado-" Babylonian records. Too many of them are apt to forget, at every convenient opportunity, that the numerous changes in language, the allegorical phraseology and evident secretiveness of old mystic writers, who were generally under the obligation never to divulge the solemn secrets of the sanctuary, might have sadly misled both translators and commentators. Most of our Orientalists will rather allow their conceit to run away with their logic and reasoning powers than admit their ignorance, and they will proudly claim like Professor Sayce[1] that they have unriddled the true meaning of the religious symbols of old, and can interpret esoteric texts far more correctly than could the initiated hierophants of Chaldea and Egypt. This amounts to saying that the ancient hiero-

*This article first appeared in *Lucifer* for September, 1896.

[1] See the *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887, pages 14-17, on the origin and growth of the religion of the ancient Babylonians, where Prof. A. H. Sayce says that though "many of the sacred texts were so written as to be intelligible *only to the initiated* [italics mine] . . . provided with keys and glosses," nevertheless, as many of the latter, he adds, "are in our hands," they (the Orientalists) have "a clue to the interpretation of these documents *which even the initiated priests did not possess.*" (p. 17.) This "clue" is the modern craze, so dear to Mr. Gladstone, and so stale in its monotony to most, which consists in perceiving in every symbol of the religions of old a solar myth, dragged down, whenever opportunity requires, to a sexual or phallic emblem. Hence the statement that while "Gisdhubar was but a champion and conqueror of old times," for the Orientalists, who "can penetrate beneath the myths" he is but a solar hero, who was himself but the transformed descendant of a humbler God of Fire (*loc. cit.*, p. 17).

grammatists and priests, who were the inventors of all the allegories which served as veils to the many truths taught at the Initiations, did not possess a clue to the sacred texts composed or written by themselves. But this is on a par with that other illusion of some Sanskritists, who, though they have never even been in India, claim to know Sanskrit accent and pronunciation, as also the meaning of the Vaidic allegories, far better than the most learned among the great Brâmanical pundits and Sanskrit scholars of India.

After this who can wonder that the jargon and blinds of our mediæval alchemists and Kabalists are also read literally by the modern student; that the Greek and even the ideas of Æschylus are *corrected* and improved upon by the Cambridge and Oxford Greek Scholars, and that the veiled parables of Plato are attributed to his "ignorance." Yet, if the students of the dead languages know anything, they ought to know that the method of extreme necessitarianism was practised in ancient as well as in modern philosophy; that from the first ages of man, the fundamental truths of all that we are permitted to know on earth were in the safe keeping of the Adepts of the sanctuary; that the difference in creeds and religious practice was only external; and that those guardians of the primitive divine revelation, who had solved every problem that is within the grasp of human intellect, were bound together by a universal freemasonry of science and philosophy, which formed one unbroken chain around the globe. It is for philology and the Orientalists to endeavour to find the end of the thread. But if they will persist in seeking it in one direction only, and that the wrong one, truth and fact will never be discovered. It thus remains the duty of psychology and Theosophy to help the world to arrive at them. Study the Eastern religions by the light of Eastern—not Western—philosophy, and if you happen to relax correctly one single loop of the old religious systems, the chain of mystery may be disentangled. But to achieve this, one must not agree with those who teach that it is unphilosophical to enquire into first causes, and that all that we can do is to consider their physical effects. The field of scientific investigation is bounded by physical nature on every side; hence, once the limits of matter are reached, enquiry must stop and work be re-commenced. As the Theosophist has no desire to play at being a squirrel upon its revolving wheel, he must refuse to follow the lead of the materialists. He, at any rate, knows that the revolutions of the physical world are, according to the ancient doctrine, attended by like revolutions in the world of intellect, for the spiritual evolution in the universe proceeds in cycles, like the physical one. Do we not see in history a regular alternation of ebb and flow in the tide of human progress? Do we not see in history, and even find this within our own experience, that the great kingdoms of the world, after reaching the culmination of their greatness, descend again, in accordance with the same law by which they ascended? till, having reached the

lowest point, humanity reasserts itself and mounts up once more, the height of its attainment being, by this law of ascending progression by cycles, somewhat higher than the point from which it had before descended. Kingdoms and empires are under the same cyclic laws as planets, races, and everything else in Kosmos.

The division of the history of mankind into what the Hindus call the Sattva, Tretya, Dvâpara and Kali Yugas, and what the Greeks referred to as "the Golden, Silver, Copper, and Iron Ages" is not a fiction. We see the same thing in the literature of peoples. An age of great inspiration and unconscious productiveness is invariably followed by an age of criticism and consciousness. The one affords material for the analyzing and critical intellect of the other. The moment is more opportune than ever for the review of old philosophies. Archæologists, philologists, astronomers, chemists and physicists are getting nearer and nearer to the point where they will be forced to consider them. Physical science has already reached its limits of exploration; dogmatic theology sees the springs of its inspiration dry. The day is approaching when the world will receive the proofs that only ancient religions were in harmony with nature, and ancient science embraced all that can be known. Once more the prophecy already made in *Isis Unveiled* twenty-two years ago is reiterated. "Secrets long kept may be revealed; books long forgotten and arts long time lost may be brought out to light again; papyri and parchments of inestimable importance will turn up in the hands of men who pretend to have unrolled them from mummies, or stumbled upon them in buried crypts; tablets and pillars, whose sculptured revelations will stagger theologians and confound scientists, may yet be excavated and interpreted. Who knows the possibilities of the future? An era of disenchantment and rebuilding will soon begin—nay, has already begun. The cycle has almost run its course; a new one is about to begin, and the future pages of history may contain full evidence, and convey full proof of the above."

Since the day that this was written much of it has come to pass, the discovery of the Assyrian clay tiles and their records alone having forced the interpreters of the cuneiform inscriptions—both Christians and Freethinkers—to alter the very age of the world.*

The chronology of the Hindu Purânas, reproduced in *The Secret Doctrine,* is now derided, but the time may come when it will be universally accepted. This may be regarded as simply an assumption, but it will be so only for the present. It is in truth but a question of time. The whole issue of the quarrel between the defenders of ancient wisdom and its detractors—lay and clerical—rests (*a*) on the incorrect comprehension of the old philosophers, for the lack of the keys the Assyriologists boast of having discovered; and (*b*) on the materialistic and anthropomorphic tendencies

*Sargon, the first "Semitic" monarch of Babylonia, the prototype and original of Moses, is now placed 3,750 years B. C. (p. 21), and the Third Dynasty of Egypt "some 6,000 years ago," hence some years before the world was created, agreeably to Biblical chronology. (*Vide Hibbert Lectures on Babylonia,* by A. H. Sayce, 1887, pp. 21 and 33).

of the age. This in no wise prevents the Darwinists and materialistic philosophers from digging into the intellectual mines of the ancients and helping themselves to the wealth of ideas they find in them; nor the divines from discovering Christian dogmas in Plato's philosophy and calling them "presentiments," as in Dr. Lundy's *Monumental Christianity,* and other like modern works.

Of such "presentiments" the whole literature—or what remains of this sacerdotal literature—of India, Egypt, Chaldea, Persia, Greece and even of Guatamala (*Pupul Vuh*), is full. Based on the same foundation-stone—the ancient Mysteries—the primitive religions, all without one exception, reflect the most important of the once universal beliefs, such, for instance, as an impersonal and universal divine Principle, absolute in its nature, and unknowable to the "brain" intellect, or the conditioned and limited cognition of man. To imagine any witness to it in the manifested universe, other than as Universal Mind, the Soul of the universe—is impossible. That which alone stands as an undying and ceaseless evidence and proof of the existence of that One Principle, is the presence of an undeniable design in kosmic mechanism, the birth, growth, death and transformation of everything in the universe, from the silent and unreachable stars down to the humble lichen, from man to the invisible lives now called microbes. Hence the universal acceptation of "Thought Divine," the Anima Mundi of all antiquity. This idea of Mahat (the great) Akâsha or Brahmâ's aura of transformation with the Hindus, of Alaya, "the divine Soul of thought and compassion" of the trans-Himâlayan mystics; of Plato's "perpetually reasoning Divinity," is the oldest of all the doctrines now known to, and believed in, by man. Therefore they cannot be said to have originated with Plato, nor with Pythagoras, nor with any of the philosophers within the historical period. Say the *Chaldean Oracles:* "The works of nature co-exist with the intellectual [νοερῷ], spiritual Light of the Father. For it is the Soul [ψυχή] which adorned the great heaven, and which adorns it after the Father."

"The incorporeal world then was already completed, having its seat in the Divine Reason," says Philo, who is erroneously accused of deriving his philosophy from Plato.

In the Theogony of Mochus, we find Æther first, and then the air; the two principles from which Ulom, the *intelligible* [νοητός] God (the visible universe of matter) is born.

In the orphic hymns, the Eros-Phanes evolves from the Spiritual Egg, which the æthereal winds impregnate, wind being "the Spirit of God," who is said to move in æther, "brooding over the Chaos"—the Divine "Idea." In the Hindu *Kathopanishad*, Purusha, the Divine Spirit, stands before the original Matter; from their union springs the great Soul of the World, "Mahâ-Atmâ, Brahm, the Spirit of Life;" these latter appellations are identical with Universal Soul, or Anima Mundi, and the Astral Light of the Theurgists and Kabalists.

Pythagoras brought his doctrines from the eastern sanctuaries, and Plato compiled them into a form more intelligible than the mysterious numerals of the Sage—whose doctrines he had fully embraced—to the uninitiated mind. Thus, the Kosmos is "the Son" with Plato, having for his father and mother the Divine Thought and Matter. The "Primal Being" (*Beings,* with the Theosophists, as they are the collective aggregation of the divine Rays), is an emanation of the Demiurgic or Universal Mind which contains from eternity the idea of the "to be created world" within itself, which idea the unmanifested Logos produces of Itself. The first Idea "born in darkness before the creation of the world" remains in the unmanifested Mind; the second is this Idea going out as a reflection from the Mind (now the manifested Logos), becoming clothed with matter, and assuming an objective existence.

PROVERBS FROM LUCIFER*

The conscience of a man governed by his passions is like the voice of a shipwrecked sailor drowned by the tempest.

If you speak well of yourself you will be distrusted
If you speak evil, you will be taken at your word!

We perceive more readily that anyone is in the wrong, when it is ourselves whom he wrongs.

Our experience consists rather of illusions lost than of wisdom gained.

Do not even think of doing what ought not to be done.

Choose rather to be strong in soul than in body.

Be persuaded that things of a laborious nature contribute more than pleasure to virtue.

Every passion of the soul is most hostile to its salvation.

It is difficult to walk at one and the same time in many paths of life.

Pythagoras said—It is requisite to choose the most excellent life: for custom will make it pleasant. Wealth is an infirm anchor, glory is still more infirm: and in a similar manner the body, dominion, and honour. For all these are imbecile and powerless. What then are powerful anchors? Prudence, magnanimity, fortitude. These no tempest can shake. This is the law of God, that virtue is the only thing that is strong: and that everything else is a trifle.

All the parts of human life, in the same manner as those of a statue, ought to be beautiful.

A statue indeed stands on its basis, but a worthy man on the subject of his deliberate choice ought to be immovable.

Frankincense ought to be given to the Gods, but praise to good men.

---

*These Proverbs were printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for February, 1891. The title used is our own.—[Ed. Theosophy.]

ON STUDYING THE SECRET DOCTRINE

ISIS UNVEILED contains many guarded references to the doctrine of cycles and the former rounds and races of this earth and its inhabitants. The great value and significance of the statements made have been missed by students generally, although they have been supposedly eager for knowledge.

A few years after the publication of *Isis,* Mr. A. P. Sinnett published his books; *The Occult World* and *Esoteric Buddhism.* The one recited his acquaintance with Madame Blavatsky and, through her mediation, his correspondence with the Master, and contains some extracts from the latter's letters giving basic ideas of occult ethics, science and philosophy and some hints on evolution. *Esoteric Buddhism* is Mr. Sinnett's effort to expound Occult cosmology and anthropogenesis from the elaboration of replies received from the Master in answer to his questions. As the book consists chiefly of Mr. Sinnett's inferences and deductions from what was written to him, and these interwoven with his rendition of the statements made him, it is necessarily colored by his personal ideas, interpretations and limitations.

Finally, in 1888, five years after *Esoteric Buddhism* and ten years after she had sent *Isis Unveiled* into the world, H. P. B. published *The Secret Doctrine.* In this she enlarged the scope and amplitude of her message and wrote a great deal in continuation of what was said in *Isis,* particularly in regard to the genesis of this earth and the evolutionary stages of the human race upon it, as well as some corrections of the mistaken ideas and recitals in *Esoteric Buddhism.*

Still five years later, in 1893, Mr. Judge published his *Ocean of Theosophy,* a small book, but containing *multum in parvo,* for it is really an index, a guide and a condensation of *The Secret Doctrine* for students who could not grasp the vast sweep of *The Secret Doctrine,* or who for various reasons were not in a position to avail themselves of its mighty contents. It is at least conceivable that Mr. Judge wrote the *Ocean* for still another reason, as follows: Mr. Sinnett never accepted the corrections made by H. P. B., and continued to maintain and teach his own views. As he was widely known and respected in the Society there grew up more and more pronounced differences of feeling and of teaching among the students, culminating in a very considerable controversy and dissension. The *Ocean* simplifies as much as possible the original teachings of Masters and H. P. B. on the subject of the former rounds and races of our preceding evolution, but reaffirms their accuracy and integrity.

All this may serve as an introduction to what follows, and is therefore only by way of rehearsal of antecedent circumstances.

Of *Isis Unveiled* H. P. B. wrote in later years that it contained only half buried the key to a hundred mysteries, and that both it

and *The Secret Doctrine* were direct statements of Occult truths from the School of the Masters. And of *The Secret Doctrine* itself one of the Masters wrote in a letter phenomenally delivered to Col. H. S. Olcott, on board ship at sea, that it contained matter that would provide the students with material for a long time to come.

Few, if any, students have profited by the stores of wisdom in *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine* as they might, and as it was undoubtedly the wish of the Masters that they should. Although Occult Science is never revealed to the profane, it is not the intention of its custodians and practicers to conceal from the really sincere and devoted either its existence or its lessons. Nature's process is followed exactly. The husk is visible to all. The kernel, the meat and the seed are masked and hidden by the husk, but only from those who ignore, deride, or fail to admit that the apparently worthless husk contains something of value. In Occultism, as everywhere in nature, effort is required to obtain results, and only those who work and are prepared to make proper use of the fruit of their labor really progress.

It is not very difficult to perceive that the subjects treated of in both *Isis* and *The Secret Doctrine* are the same, or that the method varies in the two works. *Isis Unveiled* proceeds from particulars to universals, as human reasoning and the inductive sciences do. She had to take the mind of the race as she found it and that mind is so constituted in the ordinary individual that he will only consider universals as abstractions and will not make any applications to his own case or needs, because he does not see the relation between the whole and the parts. He only can be led by concrete illustrations in the direction of the abstract as far as he will go, and that is seldom far enough to enable him to leap the gap from where his information leaves off to where real knowledge begins. So in *Isis* the method taken is to amass the particulars of human experience, human history, religion and tradition in such immense volume and overwhelming abundance as literally to "stagger" the mind, and then step by step, as the "evidence" accumulates, to point out the "law" in the case, and, finally, in the last chapter of the second volume to give the only reasonable, just, and logical "conclusions". These conclusions are the statements of the fundamental laws of nature and of being—the Universal Truths which underlie all science, and all experience. The process in *Isis*, then, of treating the great problem is to proceed from particulars to universals, from evidence as it is available to the human mind, to inferences from the human reason, and thence to the universal bases of all. It is looking from where we are toward the source from whence we have come—from below upwards, from without, within.

In *The Secret Doctrine*, the method of treatment is exactly reversed. Direct perception, or the process from the universal to the particular, is taken up. So the *Proem* to *The Secret Doctrine* contains the Three Fundamental Propositions, "upon whose clear apprehension", says H. P. B. "depends all that follows." These are

the same ideas as the numbered statements at the commencement of the final chapter in *Isis*, but differently worded. Thus the summation of *Isis* is a *conclusion* derived from the examination of evidence as afforded by past history, religion, science and tradition; while the Propositions of *The Secret Doctrine* are *inclusive* because they contain not only all the past and the present, but the future as well. *Isis* is the *Kama-Manas* of perception and experience, while *The Secret Doctrine* is the *Buddhi-Manas* of the same perception and experience of the individual and of the race. Until *Kama-Manas* is grasped and understood, *i. e.*, until the human being recognizes his *present* nature, status and function in the divine order and economy of nature, and that order and economy in all things and beings, he is unable to go behind *results* and is never anything but the victim and the prey of causes which he does not recognize or admit, because he does not perceive them. What he *calls* causes are merely a few links in the endless chain of *Karma*. He experiences without grasping that these experiences, however minute or apparently unrelated, are all integral parts of a universal order and economy of works or operation, or *Karma*, not merely present and personal. *Isis* treats of *effects experienced* in order to lead up to the recognition and consideration of *causes* which explain those effects. Until *Kama-Manas*, or the world as it is, is recognized as the effect of *Buddhi-Manas* or the world of *causation*, no consideration of *Buddhi-Manas* is possible.

The Secret Doctrine, therefore, presupposes that the evolutionary process, up to and including *Kama-Manas*, has taken place in the individual student: In other words, that he has studied *Isis Unveiled* and grasped its conclusions and is now prepared to turn round and study the past and the present path and nature of himself and the universe in the light of those universal causes with which he has now become, however imperfectly, acquainted. He has recognized and perceived the invisible presence of *Buddhi-Manas* in himself and in all nature and is now ready and willing and *eager* to study himself and nature in the light of the *new perceptions* acquired. He is now to study *Kama-Manas* in the light of *Buddhi-Manas*, not *Buddhi-Manas* in the light of *Kama-Manas*, as hitherto in his prior existences and in his reading of *Isis*.

This is the most portentous stage in the evolution of the individual Soul. He is literally, not metaphorically, *at the turning point of evolution*, when he has awakened to this significance of nature, of himself, of the Wisdom-Religion. It is for him, and for no other, that *The Secret Doctrine* was written. To all others it is and must remain a sealed book, an apocalypse, until, like John of old, they too, shall retire to the Patmos of reflection in the sea of silence, and there, blind to all else, consider the mystery of the vision accorded to them—the mystery of the new heaven and the new earth—the book of the revelation of all things as

seen through the opened eye of *Buddhi-Manas*—the *eternal* pilgrim.

He read *Isis* as a person, a thing of mortality, of this life and of this life only. He arose from that reading reborn—the spirit in him awakened. He is now an individual—a divinely awakened Ego. The Great Idea is incarnate in him, and he finds himself swimming in a shoreless ocean of light and life and law and order. *Isis* is, therefore, a personal book. But *The Secret Doctrine* is the tome of the Immortal. It is the book of life eternal and he is of the Company of the writers of it—the Immortal Masters and their deathless servants, for he has become Their pupil, and They have become in truth his Teacher. He has found his way to the path to the Elder Brothers of the Race.

Now he will read *The Secret Doctrine* as it was written to be read: The record of his own path and purpose, undivided and unspent through all times and circumstances, and as he reads the external record, step by step the inner memory will waken in him —and he will ***know***.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PATH*

* * * * * * * * while the founders of *The Path* are Theosophists, they do not speak authoritatively for the Theosophical Society. It is true that had they never heard of Theosophy, or were they not members of the Society, they would not have thought of bringing out this magazine, the impulse for which arose directly from Theosophical teachings and literature.

It is because they are men, and therefore interested in anything concerning the human race, that they have resolved to try on the one hand to point out to their fellows a Path in which they have found hope for man, and on the other to investigate all systems of ethics and philosophy claiming to lead directly to such a path, regardless of the possibility that the highway may, after all, be in another direction from the one in which they are looking. From their present standpoint it appears to them that the true path lies in the way pointed out by our Aryan forefathers, philosophers, and sages, whose light is still shining brightly, albeit that this is now Kali Yuga, or the age of darkness.

The solution of the problem, "What and Where is the Path to Happiness," has been discovered by those of old time. They thought it was in the pursuit of Raja Yoga, which is the highest science and the highest religion—a union of both. In elaborating this, they wrote much more than we can hope to master in the lifetime of this journal, and they have had many kinds of followers, many devotees, who, while earnestly desiring to arrive at truth, have

*These extracts are taken from the opening editorial printed by Wm. Q. Judge in the first issue of *The Path*, April, 1886.

erred in favor of the letter of the teachings. Such are some of the mendicants of Hindoostan who insist upon the verbal repetition of OM for thousands of times, or upon the practice of postures and breathing alone, forgetting that over all stands the real man, at once the spectator of and sufferer by these mistakes. *This is not the path.*

At the same time we do not intend to slight the results arrived at by others who lived within our own era. They shall receive attention, for it may be that the mind of the race has changed so as to make it necessary now to present truths in a garb which in former times was of no utility. Whatever the outer veil, the truth remains ever the same.

The study of what is now called "practical occultism" has some interest for us, and will receive the attention it may merit, but is not *the* object of this journal. We regard it as incidental to the journey along the path. The traveller, in going from one city to another, has, perhaps, to cross several rivers; may be his conveyance fails him and he is obliged to swim, or he must, in order to pass a great mountain, know engineering in order to tunnel through it, or is compelled to exercise the art of locating his exact position by observation of the sun; but all that is only incidental to his main object of reaching his destination. We admit the existence of hidden, powerful forces in nature, and believe that every day greater progress is made toward an understanding of them. Astral body formation, clairvoyance, looking into the astral light, and controlling elementals, are all possible, but not all profitable. The electrical current, which, when resisted in the carbon, produces intense light, may be brought into existence by any ignoramus who has the key to the engine room and can turn the crank that starts the dynamo, but is unable to prevent his fellow man or himself from being instantly killed, should that current accidentally be diverted through his body. The control of these hidden forces is not easily obtained, nor can phenomena be produced without danger, and in our view the attainment of true wisdom is not by means of phenomena, but through the development which begins within. Besides that, mankind in the mass are not able to reach to phenomena, while every one can understand right thought, right speech, and right action.

True occultism is clearly set forth in the *Bhagavad-Gita* and *Light on the Path*, where sufficient stress is laid upon practical occultism, but after all, Krishna says, the kingly science and the kingly mystery is devotion to and study of the light which comes from within. The very first step in true mysticism and true occultism is to try to apprehend the meaning of Universal Brotherhood, without which the very highest progress in the practice of magic turns to ashes in the mouth.

We appeal, therefore, to all who wish to raise themselves and their fellow creatures—man and beast—out of the thoughtless jog trot of selfish everyday life. It is not thought that Utopia can be

established in a day; but through the spreading of the idea of Universal Brotherhood, the truth in all things may be discovered. Certainly, if we all say that it is useless, that such highly-strung, sentimental notions cannot obtain currency, nothing will ever be done. A beginning must be made, and it has been by the Theosophical Society. Although philanthropic institutions and schemes are constantly being brought forward by good and noble men and women, vice, selfishness, brutality, and the resulting misery, seem to grow no less. Riches are accumulating in the hands of the few, while the poor are ground harder every day as they increase in number. Prisons, asylums for the outcast and the magdalen, can be filled much faster than it is possible to erect them. All this points unerringly to the existence of a vital error somewhere. It shows that merely healing the outside by hanging a murderer or providing asylums and prisons will never reduce the number of criminals nor the hordes of children born and growing up in hotbeds of vice. What is wanted is true knowledge of the spiritual condition of man, his aim and destiny. This is offered to a reasonable certainty in the Aryan literature, and those who must begin the reform are those who are so fortunate as to be placed in the world where they can see and think out the problems all are endeavoring to solve, even if they know that the great day may not come until after their death. Such a study leads us to accept the utterance of Prajapati to his sons: "Be restrained, be liberal, be merciful;" it is the death of selfishness.

FROM THE SECRET DOCTRINE*

Thus the reader is asked to bear in mind the very important difference between *orthodox* Buddhism—*i. e.*, the public teachings of Gautama the Buddha, and his esoteric *Budhism*. His Secret Doctrine, however, differed in no wise from that of the initiated Brahmins of his day. The Buddha was a child of the Aryan soil, a born Hindu, a Kshatrya and a disciple of the "twice born" (the initiated Brahmins) or Dwijas. His teachings, therefore, could not be different from their doctrines, for the whole Buddhist reform merely consisted in giving out a portion of that which had been kept secret from every man outside of the "enchanted" circle of Temple-Initiates and ascetics. Unable to teach *all* that had been imparted to him—owing to his pledges—though he taught a philosophy built upon the ground-work of the true esoteric knowledge, the Buddha gave to the world only its *outward* material body and kept its *soul* for his Elect. (See also Volume II.) Many Chinese scholars among Orientalists have heard of the "Soul Doctrine." None seem to have understood its real meaning and importance.

* From the Original Edition Vol. I—Introductory—, p. xxi; see Vol. I—Introductory—, p. 5 Third Edition.

BUDDHISM, CHRISTIANITY AND PHALLICISM*

By H. P. Blavatsky

WORKS by specialists and scholars have to be treated with a certain respect, due to science. But such works as Payne Knight's *On the Worship of Priapus,* and the *Ancient Faiths,* etc., of Dr. Inman, were merely the precursory drops of the shower of phallicism that burst upon the reading public in the shape of General Forlong's *Rivers of Life.* Very soon lay writers followed the torrent, and Hargrave Jennings' charming volume, *The Rosicrucians,* was superseded by his *Phallicism.*

As an elaborate account of this work—that hunts up sexual worship, from the grossest forms of idolatry up to its most refined and hidden symbolism in Christianity—would better suit a newspaper review than a journal like the present, it becomes necessary to state at once the reason it is noticed at all. Were Theosophists entirely to ignore it, *Phallicism* [1] and such-like works would be used some day against Theosophy. Mr. Hargrave Jennings' last production was written, in every probability, to arrest its progress—erroneously confounded as it is by many with Occultism, pure and simple, and even with Buddhism itself. *Phallicism* appeared in 1884, just at a time when all the French and English papers heralded the arrival of a few Theosophists from India as the advent of Buddhism in Christian Europe—the former in their usual flippant way, the latter with an energy that might have been worthy of a better cause, and might have been more appropriately directed against "sexual worship at home," according to certain newspaper revelations. Whether rightly or wrongly, public rumour attributes this "mystic" production of Mr. Hargrave Jennings to the advent of Theosophy. However it may be, and whosoever may have inspired the author, his efforts were crowned with success only in one direction. Notwithstanding that he proclaims himself, modestly enough, "the first introducer of the grand philosophical problem of this mysterious Buddhism," and pronounces his work "undoubtedly new and original," declaring in the same breath that all the "previous great men and profound thinkers (before himself) labouring through the ages (in this direction) have worked in vain," it is easy to prove the author mistaken. His "enthusiasm" and self-laudation may be very sincere, and no doubt his labours were "enormous," as he says; they have nevertheless led him on an entirely false track, when he asserts that:

"These physiological contests (about the mysteries of animal generation) . . . induced in the reflective wisdom of the earli-

* This article was first published in *Lucifer* for July, 1896.

[1] *Phallicism, Celestial and Terrestrial, Heathen and Christian;* its connection with the Rosicrucians and the Gnostics and its foundation in Buddhism.

est thinkers, laid the sublime foundations of the phallic worship. They led to violent schisms in religion, and to Buddhism."

Now it is precisely Buddhism which was the first religious system in history that sprang up with the determinate object of putting an end to all the male Gods and to the degrading idea of a sexual personal Deity being the generator of mankind and the Father of men.

His book, the author assures us: "Comprises within the limit of a modest octavo all that can be known of the doctrines of the Buddhists, Gnostics, and Rosicrucians as connected with phallicism."

In this he errs again, and most profoundly, or—which would be still worse—he is trying to mislead the reader by filling him with disgust for such "mysteries." His work is "new and original" in so far as it explains with enthusiastic and reverential approval the strong phallic element in the *Bible;* for, as he says, "Jehovah undoubtedly signifies the universal male," and he calls Mary Magdalen before her conversion the "female St. Michael," as a mystical antithesis and paradox. No one, truly, in Christian countries before him has ever had the moral courage to speak so openly as he does of the phallic element with which the Christian Church (the Roman Catholic) is honeycombed, and this is the author's chief desert and credit. But all the merit of the boasted "conciseness and brevity" of his "modest octavo" disappears on its becoming the undeniable and evident means of leading the reader astray under the most false impressions; especially as very few, if any, of its readers will follow or even share his "enthusiasm . . . converted out of the utmost original disbelief of these wondrously stimulating and beautiful phallic beliefs." Nor is it fair or honest to give out a portion of the truth, without allowing any room for a palliative, as is done in the cases of Buddha and Christ. That which the former did in India, Jesus repeated in Palestine. Buddhism was a passionate reactionary protest against the phallic worship that led every nation first to the adoration of a *personal* God, and finally to black magic, and the same object was aimed at by the Nazarene Initiate and prophet. Buddhism escaped the curse of black magic by keeping clear of a personal male God in its religious system; but this conception reigning supreme in the so-called monotheistic countries, black magic—the fiercer and stronger for being utterly disbelieved in by its most ardent votaries, unconscious perhaps of its presence among them—is drawing them nearer and nearer to the maëlstrom of every nation given to sin, or to sorcery, pure and simple. No Occultist believes in the devil of the Church, the traditional Satan; every student of Occultism and every Theosophist believes in black magic, and in dark, natural powers present in the worlds, if he accept the white or divine science as an actual fact on our globe. Therefore one may repeat in full confidence the remark made by Cardinal Ventura on the devil—only applying it to black magic;

"The greatest victory of Satan was gained on that day when he succeeded in making himself denied."

It may be said further, that "black magic reigns over Europe as an all-powerful, though unrecognized, autocrat," its chief conscious adherents and practical servants being found in the Roman Church, and its unconscious practitioners in the Protestant. The whole body of the so-called "privileged" classes of society in Europe and America is honeycombed with unconscious black magic, or sorcery of the vilest character.

But Christ is not responsible for the mediaeval and the modern Christianity fabricated in His name. And if the author of *Phallicism* be right in speaking of the transcendental sexual worship in the Roman Church and calling it "true, although doubtless of profound mystical strictly 'Christian' paradoxical construction," he is wrong in calling it the "celestial or Theosophical doctrine of the unsexual, transcendental phallicism," for all such words strung together become meaningless by annulling each other. "Paradoxical" indeed must be that "construction" which seeks to show the phallic element in "the tomb of the Redeemer," and the yonic in Nirvâna, besides finding a Priapus in the "Word made Flesh" or the LOGOS. But such is the "Priapomania" of our century that even the most ardent professed Christians have to admit the element of phallicism in their dogmas, lest they should be twitted with it by their opponents.

This is not meant as criticism, but simply as the defence of real, true magic, confined by the author of *Phallicism* to the "divine magic of generation." "Phallic ideas," he says, are "discovered to be the foundation of all religions."

In this there is nothing "new" or "original." Since state religions came into existence, there was never an Initiate or philosopher, a Master or disciple, who was ignorant of it. Nor is there any fresh discovery in the fact of Jehovah having been worshipped by the Jews under the shape of "phallic stones" (unhewn)—of being, in short, as much of a phallic God as any other Lingam, which fact has been no mystery from the days of Dupuis. That he was preeminently a male deity—a Priapus—is now proven absolutely and without show of useless mysticism, by Ralston Skinner of Cincinnati, in his wonderfully clever and erudite volume, *The Source of Measures*, published some years ago, in which he demonstrates the fact on mathematical grounds, completely versed, as he seems to be, in kabalistic numerical calculations. What then makes the author of *Phallicism* say that in his book will be found "a more complete and more connected account than has hitherto appeared of the different forms of the . . . peculiar veneration (not idolatry), generally denominated the phallic worship?" "No previous writer has disserted so fully," he adds with modest reserve, "upon the shades and varieties of this singular ritual, or traced up so completely its mysterious blendings with the ideas of the philosophers as to what lies remotely in nature in regard to the origin of the history of the human race."

There is one thing really "original" and "new" in *Phallicism*, and it is this: while noticing and underlining the most filthy rites connected with phallic worship among every "heathen" nation, those of the Christians are idealized, and a veil of a most mystic fabric is thrown over them. At the same time the author accepts and insists upon Biblical chronology. Thus he assigns to the Chaldæan Tower of Babel—"that magnificent, monster, 'upright,' defiant phallus," as he puts it—an age "soon after the Flood"; and to the Pyramids "a date not long after the foundation of the Egyptian monarchy of Misraim, the son of Ham, 2188 B. C." The chronological views of the author of *The Rosicrucians* seem to have greatly changed of late. There is a mystery about his book, difficult, yet not wholly impossible to fathom, which may be summed up in the words of the Comte de Gasparin with regard to the works on Satan by the Marquis de Mirville: "Everything goes to show a work which is essentially an act, and has the value of a collective labour."

But this is of no moment to the Theosophists. That which is of real importance is his misleading statement, which he supports on Wilford's authority, that the legendary war that began in India and spread all over the globe was caused by a diversity of opinion upon the relative "superiority of the male or female emblem . . . in regard of the idolatrous magic worship . . . These physiological disputes led to violent schisms in religion and even to bloody and devastating wars, which have wholly passed out of the history . . . or have never been recorded in history . . . remaining only as a tradition."

This is denied point-blank by initiated Brâhmanas.

If the above be given on Col. Wilford's authority, then the author of *Phallicism* was not fortunate in his selection. The reader has only to turn to Max Müller's *Science of Religion* to find therein the detailed history of Col. Wilford becoming—and very honestly confessing to the fact—the victim of Brâhmanical mystification with regard to the alleged presence of Shem, Ham, and Japhet in the Purânas. The true history of the dispersion and the cause of the great war are very well known to the initiated Brâhmanas, only they will not tell it, as it would go directly against themselves and their supremacy over those who believe in a personal God and Gods. It is quite true that the origin of every religion is based on the dual powers, male and female, of abstract Nature, but these in their turn were the radiations or emanations of the sexless, infinite, absolute Principle, the only One to be worshipped in spirit and not with rites; whose immutable laws no words of prayer or propitiation can change, and whose sunny or shadowy, beneficent or maleficent influence, grace or curse, under the form of Karma, can be determined only by the actions—not by the empty supplications—of the devotee. This was the religion, the One Faith of the whole of primitive humanity, and was that of the "Sons of God," the B'ne Elohim of old. This faith assured to its followers the full possession of tran-

scendental psychic powers, of the truly divine magic. Later on, when mankind fell, in the natural course of its evolution "into generation," *i. e.*, into human creation and procreation, and carrying down the subjective process of Nature from the plane of spirituality to that of matter—made in its selfish and animal adoration of self a God of the human organism, and worshipped self in this objective personal Deity, then was black magic initiated. This magic or sorcery is based upon, springs from, and has the very life and soul of selfish impulse; and thus was gradually developed the idea of a personal God. The first "pillar of unhewn stone," the first objective "*sign* and witness to the Lord," creative, generative, and the "Father of man," was made to become the archetype and progenitor of the long series of male (vertical) and female (horizontal) Deities, of pillars, and cones. Anthropomorphism in religion is the direct generator of and stimulus to the exercise of black, left-hand magic. And it was again merely a feeling of selfish national exclusiveness—not even patriotism—of pride and self-glorification over all other nations, that could lead an Isaiah to see a difference between the one living God and the idols of the neighbouring nations. In the day of the great "change," Karma, whether called personal or impersonal Providence, will see no difference between those who set an altar (horizontal) to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar (vertical) at the border thereof (*Is.* xix. 19) and they "who seek to the idols, and to the charmers, and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards"—for all this is human, hence devilish black magic.

It is then the latter magic, coupled with anthropomorphic worship, that caused the "Great War" and was the reason for the "Great Flood" of Atlantis; for this reason also the Initiates—those who had remained true to primeval Revelation—formed themselves into separate communities, keeping their magic or religious rites in the profoundest secrecy. The caste of the Brâhmanas, the descendants of the "mind-born Rishis and Sons of Brahmâ" dates from those days, as also do the "Mysteries."

Natural sciences, archaeology, theology, philosophy, all have been forced in *The Secret Doctrine* to give their evidence in support of the teachings herein again propounded. *Vox audita perit: litera scripta manet.* Published admissions cannot be made away with—even by an opponent: they have been made good use of. Had I acted otherwise, *The Secret Doctrine*, from the first chapter to the last, would have amounted to uncorroborated personal affirmations. Scholars and some of the latest discoveries in various departments of science being brought to testify to what might have otherwise appeared to the average reader as the most preposterous hypotheses based upon unverified assertions, the rationality of these will be made clearer. Occult teaching will at last be examined in the light of science, physical as well as spiritual.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Azoth for November contains, under the general title of "Thumbnail Sketches of Creeds and Isms," an article on Theosophy by H. S. Whitcomb in which with a great deal that is good and true there is also a considerable quantitum of misapprehension of fact and confusion of thought. Mr. Whitcomb premises by saying that a "sharp distinction must be made between *Theosophy* on the one side and the Theosophical Society on the other." This is sound, but Mr. Whitcomb himself does not closely adhere to this distinction, nor as to what Theosophy really is. He is confused by names and claims, and apparently has fallen into the pitfall of thinking any ideas to be Theosophy if so claimed and labeled; as well as to think that any organization assuming the name "the Theosophical Society" is *the theosophical society.* As to the latter mistake it should be sufficient to state that in 1888 H. P. B. publicly stated that The Theosophical Society had ceased to be, and now consisted merely of a number of independent and autonomus lodges, acting as they thought fit; that Mr. Judge stated in 1895 that the real theosophical society consisted of all those who are the friends of the human race; and, finally, that at the present time there are three distinct and antagonistic organizations each calling itself by the same name, "*The* Theosophical Society," besides numerous associations using the word Theosophy or its derivatives as part of their appellation. After a page of criticisms of what he understands to be theosophy and theosophical practice this writer sums up and numbers his objections. It should suffice to say that what he objects to is distinctly *not* Theosophy and that his *objections* are a good deal nearer true Theosophical practice than the practices which he criticizes, thinking them to be theosophical. He says he does not undertake to "traverse or criticize" the "findings of Theosophy." But he does desire to state, "most emphatically, that the *manner* and *method* of *getting at these alleged facts* is fundamentally wrong in this;" and then goes on to number his remarks and criticisms. The things to which he objects are in fact those perversions taught as theosophy by those who have strayed far, far, from the discipline and knowledge of true Theosophy or Occultism. For this perversion not Mr. Whitcomb but false students and would-be "adepts" are responsible. Mr. Whitcomb's conclusions are for the most part sound, but his premises are fundamentally erroneous. It is the familiar illustration of the logical man of straw set up and demolished. His diatribe is right and true as against many individuals in one or another of the trinity of "the theosophical society," but absolutely wrong in regard to Theosophy. The latter, most evidently, he does not understand, and very probably because he has gotten his "theosophy" at second-hand, or diluted and muddied the waters of his understanding with draughts at impure streams. Mr. Whitcomb concludes by the opinion that "the average individual would have his hands full in doing exactly right each day." True, but what is the basis of "doing exactly right?" Is it the individual's own guess and desires, is it the "theosophy" of the churches, creeds and interpreters and priests, "theosophical" or otherwise, or is it clearly perceived principles eternal and universal in their very nature, and their application in daily life, which is the only THEOSOPHY H. P. B. ever taught or practiced?

Mr. Whitcomb and other sincere students might go farther and fare worse than by reading and pondering a Letter to the *Editor* of *Azoth,* printed at page 689 of the same number in which his article appears. This letter, as

it happens, is on "The Theosophical Society" of which Mrs. Besant is the head and treats of the very matters of which Mr. Whitcomb writes, but in shining contrast, for the writer evidently has been a diligent student both of the writings of Madame Blavatsky and of the history of the Theosophical Movement at first hand, and so is neither deceiving nor deceived in his statements. This correspondent, also as it happens, quotes enough from H. P. B. herself both to inform and correct the misapprehension of fact and mistaken ideas of Mr. Whitcomb. The closing paragraph of his Letter sums up by saying, the proof having been furnished,

> "Mrs. Besant and her associates have taught, practiced, promulgated those things against which H. P. B. warned, and have obscured, neglected, derided and ignored those things on which H. P. B. laid stress as the Heart of the Teachings. The membership in Mrs. Besant's society cannot follow Mrs. Besant's lines and teachings and those of H. P. B.——two polar antitheses."

We commend this Letter to Mr. Whitcomb, who is evidently sincere and earnest minded, but who has gained his ideas as to theosophy and theosophical practices from sources that are the "polar antithesis" of real Theosophy and real application.

Still a third article in *Azoth* is by Eugene Del Mar on the subject of "Higher Thought." The ideas expressed are all good Theosophy, but how came the author by them? Did he invent or discover them himself? Did he gain them from any other source than from the writings, whether at first or second-hand, of H. P. B.? If he got them from Theosophy why not say so? If he got them from any other Source why does he not admit and refer to the source of his ideas? Many may be moved to follow up the ideas advanced in Mr. Del Mar's article. Where shall they turn? To whom apply? If Mr. Del Mar claims to be the source of these ideas, well and good, but we scarcely think he would have that hardihood. If he merely found them and finding them good adopted them, that also is good for him, but it is not good for him, and for others, for him to place himself in the light of the source, leaving inquirers no alternative but to come to him. To do that is not to adopt and promulgate ideas and teachings he has found good, but to put himself in the position of one who "appropriates" a thing of value and exploits something not his own for his own name's sake. We hope to see Mr. Del Mar correct this false posture and place himself no less than the ideas he expounds in proper setting.

The *American Magazine* for November announces a "prize contest" on the subject, "What Comes After This Life?" Prizes of $20, $10, and $5, are offered for "the best letters of about 500 words on any phase of the subject you choose." The editor urges "if you *do* write, be frank, be honest, and report your deepest spiritual experiences." Evidently the word "spiritual" means to the aforesaid editor anything and everything beyond the physical, an error which he from his editorial position is serving to perpetuate and extend. No doubt, he is not the only one who *follows* popular misconceptions, instead of being leaders and guides in the direction of a true basis for thinking, which they might be if they would only take the pains to acquire it. We have had Sir Oliver Lodge, Elsa Barker and others of similar trend, setting forth their *personal psychological experiences* as evidences of "spirit life" beyond the grave, their very statements themselves proving that the "experiences" were purely personal, besides being out of agreement with

each other. Not only are these "experiences" personal, but essentially physical, for they do not point to anything but dreams and nightmares of the life experiences and ideas of the "departed," a state of consciousness to which the word "spiritual" is wholly inapplicable. Neither do they explain the actual state of those who leave the body from natural causes, from so-called accidental death, or from suicidal action. Sooner or later it will be found that the after death state of each person depends upon how he thought, felt and acted during life, and that in the majority of cases this state is entirely subjective, and as much in reach of a waking living person as is the state of one who is asleep and dreaming. One can readily perceive how valueless such "communications" must be, granting that conditions may at times favor such.

There might be some excuse for the methods pursued by magazine writers and others if no other avenues for research existed, but when, for nearly forty years, it has been publicly and repeatedly stated that *actual knowledge exists and is obtainable* in regard to Man's origin, nature, history, development and destiny, the student of this knowledge is forced to the conclusion that popularity, with its adjuncts of fame and financial success is of more importance to these writers than right knowledge.

We have little to add to the article quoted below, which appeared in one of the more important Pacific Coast newspapers a short time ago. Indeed this editorial is so true and timely that we reprint it in full; for it emphasizes in a most practical way a statement many times made to inquirers who would have the Editors of THEOSOPHY give them a cue as to the value of this, that or the other cult or "movement": "If a claim to knowledge is made by some person, you may know from this fact that knowledge is not there; if money is asked, you may be sure that truth cannot be purchased." The editorial was headed, "The Mists of Mysticism":

> There is one more new cult, the leaders of which are sending literature broadcast with the evident intention of persuading people to hit their trail. On the door of the building which serves as headquarters for the cult there is a picture of Uncle Sam and under the picture are printed the words "I want you to come in and investigate." One circular bears as a caption the bold declaration: "This is the way to find out What God really is," and further down in the circular is the invitation, "Just investigate; we ask no more." Is that, indeed, all that is asked by the teachers of such cults?
>
> One of the first steps usually taken by so-called masters and mystics is to win the confidence of people by a pretended sincerity, declaring that there are really no miracles or mysteries; that everything is according to natural law (which may or may not be true,) and that the business and pleasure of the teacher is to freely impart his knowledge of these laws to the truth-seeking multitude. To those who attend their gatherings they hint that, after all, there are mysteries that only the elect may be taught and which they offer to explain to the devotee at so much per mystery. For, after all, they admit that they (the so-called masters) live in a very material world in which money is necessary to buy food and clothes and to pay room rent and electric light bills.
>
> The strange part of it is that so many apparently sound individuals are duped into paying good money to be told things which their common sense should teach them. As far as understanding God is concerned, it is questionable if any man on earth knows more than any other man. All that can be said about the student of philosophies and religions is

that he has thought more and longer on these subjects than the average mortal. To say that he therefore knows more about the Infinite or Life in its essence is only to announce one's belief that certain powers are given to some men that are denied to others. Instead of looking into their own minds and hearts for truth, many people seem to have a chronic habit of applying to the so-called mystics for wisdom and instruction, only to discover later that they have been led deeper into the mists than they were before they entered the "inner circles."

Yet the seeker should realize that the existence of counterfeits is a sure sign that there is the genuine. Knowledge does exist; but it cannot be purchased with coin of the realm, nor conferred as a favor. Those who seek for it unselfishly, and in the right way, can find it, as the Christs of all ages have unanimously affirmed.

The watch on the Lookout sees some queer drift on the sea of life; things small in themselves, perhaps ridiculous, perhaps absurd, but all in their way signs of the times, and spelling a significance sometimes like the floating wreck and the flying land-birds that cheered Columbus on his voyage into the unknown. *Adventure* is a bi-monthly magazine given over to tales of thrills, mystery and daring—a kind of reincarnated *Beadle's;* perhaps the very Land's-End of literature; certainly a posit and placement for occultism as little to be dreamt of as among Australian Bushmen. None-the-less, in the issue for December 18, the leading story is "The Petals of Lao-Tze," a yarn of a search for the recovery of the eighth and last of the golden petals hidden in a Tibetan cave, whereon is inscribed the formula for which old Ponce de Leon long searched in Florida—secret of eternal youth. *Stuart McVea,* "mystic, scientist and mental recluse," sips attenuated Scotch whisky, and is certain that Confucius, Lao-Tze, and the dim line receding into tradition, possessed the secret of secrets. The *Dugpas,* the *Bhons,* the *Dalai-Lama,* the magic "six syllabled sentence" of which Arnold makes such thrilling employ in the closing verse of the "Light of Asia," are all woven into the scenario. Mr. *McVea* gains his petal, brews his concoction—and dies. Mr. *McAdie,* "the greatest Sanskrit scholar living," who has aided Mr. *McVea* in deciphering the formula, sagely sums up: "I have heard of Lao-Tze's elixir of life of course. It was Lao-Tze who said, 'Death is the portal to the House of Life.' Whatever merit there may have been in the thing, the ingredients were undoubtedly powerful and only to be taken after *a long course of physical and mental preparation. He did not take that into consideration.*" So the tale advertises occultism—in its own way, of course—and fails not to point the moral, as all good stories should. There are many *Stuart McVeas* in the land of the living, who are constantly endeavoring to wrest from nature and from Occultism the secrets which they hold—all seeking by stealth or force to enter the "forbidden Land," and as Mr. McAdie remarks, they forget that the ingredients are powerful and only to be taken after a long course of physical and mental preparation. They "do not take that into consideration." For are the devotees of spiritualism, seances, psychic phenomena, mental healing, automatic writing, and all the multiform shoots of pseudo-occultism, any wiser than *Stuart McVea?*